The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1922 NUMBER 374

Contents

The Week 257

Editorials

The Subversion of Public Education..... 259
France Contra Mundum..... 262
Representation on the Reserve Board..... 264
Why Conferences Rather Than the League?... 265

General Articles

An American Transportation System, I.....
.....Edwin J. Clapp 267
Deported.....Susanne K. Langer 270
Doppelgänger (Verse).....William Rose Benét 271
The New Peace and Billie Burke.....
.....Dorothée Raël Meirowsky 272
Lloyd George and the Ides of March.....
.....An English Liberal 273
Geneva: Half a League Onward.....
.....Manley O. Hudson 276

Correspondence 278
The Love for Three Oranges.....Janet A. Fairbank 282
Beauty and the Beast.....Stark Young 283
Country Songs.....Padraic Colum 284

Reviews of Books

Is Minding Behaving?.....H. M. Kallen 285
Delos F. Wilcox on Transit..Emmett L. Bennett 286
The Antic Philosophers.....Keith Preston 288

Selected Current Books..... 290

The Week

MR. LLOYD GEORGE'S speech of January 21st throws a flood of light upon the state of mind in which that statesman went to Cannes. He is profoundly stirred by the apparently hopeless slide toward disaster and chaos which is taking place in Europe and he is dedicating his abilities and energy to the task of checking the downfall and of starting Europe on a return journey towards recovery. He sees only one way of possibly accomplishing this result; and that is by "insistent meeting, discussing, reasoning and conference." "Each conference is a rung in the ladder that enables you to reach ultimate peace on earth." "Without peace there is no use having economics." What he is seeking at Genoa is, consequently, primarily a political settlement. He is summoning the nations to a meeting which he hopes will become or prepare for an ultimate constituent assembly of a new and better Europe.

THE ardor and intensity of Mr. Lloyd George's pacific revivalism do him honor. It is the most encouraging development which has taken place for many years in that chaotic European compound of frustration, cynicism, suffering, despair, sentimentality, confusion, violence and futility. But what a damning criticism the Lloyd George of 1922 is uttering against the Lloyd George of the winter of 1918-19. The Paris Conference, which was called for the purpose of restoring peace to Europe, with whose decisions Mr. Lloyd George had much to do, and whose achievements he has so frequently defended, perpetrated a treaty of peace which has served ever since as a stimulus to dissolution and as a bar to appeasement. It possessed none of the characteristics which Mr. Lloyd George hopes to discover in the Conference at Genoa and its successors. It did not bring the nations "to the test of reason and not of force." On the contrary, the victorious conferees refused to discuss with the vanquished an instrument which was supposed to determine the latter's destiny during at least two generations. They were passing sentence and taking revenge rather than establishing peace. It was one of the most deliberate and unpardonable acts of sheer violence which a group of civilized statesmen ever committed. As an act of violence it was comparable to Germany's own offence in starting the war. Mr. Lloyd George is now trying really to appease Europe but his most serious obstacle is the ghost of his own past performances. There can be no peace and goodwill in Europe until the Treaty of Versailles is written off.

THE Washington Conference continues to confer chiefly for the purpose of reaching an agreement about Shantung which the Chinese delegation dares to accept. Such an agreement has become, as it now appears, necessary to the ratification of the Four Power Treaty by the Senate. The Democratic Senators are not unwilling in the interest of supposed party benefit to defeat the Treaty, provided they can discover some noble public interest which will be served by voting against it. They are hoping to discover it in the treatment which the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conference metes out to China. They are preparing to prove, if they can, that the Four Power Concert will make of the United States Japan's accomplice in the Far East, and they will consider the failure of the Shantung negotiation as sufficient evidence of American subservience. They were willing themselves to ratify a treaty which would have committed the United States to the support of Japanese vested interests in Shantung, but they are now proposing to defeat a treaty because it may have the effect of temporarily conniving at a Japanese settlement in Shantung to which they by their votes have already consented. Senatorial pressure in favor of China on the American delegation is useful and desirable, but the solicitude of Democratic Senators for the liberation of Shantung is not convincing.

THERE are some Americans, ardent champions of the doctrine that things are always what they seem, who assume that whatever may be the case with the rest of Europe, the financial position of France has been improved by the substitution of Poincaré's policy for that of Briand. Poincaré stands uncompromisingly for the exaction of every gold mark Germany was forced to promise in the London agreement. Briand, it is true, never agreed to abate the French claims, but his final policy of conciliation faced in that direction. Poincaré promises a more vigorous effort at collection, which seems to mean more money for France and an improvement in French credit. But if it really meant this, French exchange ought to rise, and there ought to be a boom on the Paris Bourse. The reverse is true. The franc fell upon the triumph of Poincaré, and the Bourse sagged depressingly. The most furious sheriff can no more collect non-existent funds than can the mildest mannered one. But a furious sheriff may be popular with the creditors, until they have come to recognize that fury is a luxury for which they have to pay dear. In time the French people will have to learn that impossible claims are an insuperable obstacle to the realization of possible ones. And when they have learned this they will no longer want the services of Poincaré, or even of Briand. They will look for someone who will face the facts and insist on such a revision of the indemnity as to make it a genuine financial asset instead of a maleficent delusion.

GOVERNOR MILLER and President Nicholas Murray Butler might reasonably be expected to stand forth as unwavering exponents of the political principles of Alexander Hamilton. They belong, by training and temperament, in the most conservative wing of the Hamiltonian party. But it has been known since time immemorial that principles are not so persistent as the interests underlying them. The party of Hamilton demanded a strong central government because, as they conceived it, the interests of the whole people, and especially the interests of the men of property and enterprise, were safer under a central government than under state and local control. Today it would be impossible to maintain that this is true. Washington is not so conservative as Albany. Accordingly Dr. Butler and Governor Miller are fulminating against bureaucracy and centralization, after the old Jeffersonian manner. Both agree that federal aid to education, with the accounting that it implies, is a terrible danger to the vitality of state government. Governor Miller is further gravely disturbed by the Maternity law. Better that mothers and babies die of neglect than that the federal government should get the habit of prying into the household affairs of the states. It may be hard to see a direct connection between the vitality of the states and their right to leave undone, or to do badly, things that need to be done well. But there is an important indirect connection. Whatever the federal government does has to be paid for out of taxation, and the federal government is able to place the bulk of taxation squarely upon the men of business and property, something the states are unable to do.

A COAL strike would work vast injury to miners, operators and public alike, and it will be averted if there is any industrial statesmanship in the federal administration. This is not a case in which the labor leaders are confident of success and eager for the conflict. They recognize the weakness of labor in time of depression. They are asking for increased wages and various other improvements in the position of labor, but these demands must be considered in the light of the fact that the employers are planning to cut wages. Both sides are at present engaged in an offensive-defensive propaganda campaign, in preparation for the struggle that may come in April. The consumer of coal does not see why it is necessary for the industry to throw the whole economic machinery of the country out of commission while operators and miners haggle over percentages of wages and profits. The consumer pays enough for coal to satisfy the legitimate demands of both miners and operators. But what the consumer pays seems to get lost somehow in transmission. When anthracite at the pit's mouth together with railway charges to New York costs less than one half of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the price exacted from the consumer, there must be enormous waste somewhere, or profiteering. Waste, we think, accounts for most of the margin. And until we get rid of it we shall have neither industrial peace nor cheap coal.

LORD BRYCE was more eminent as a historian, a publicist and a man of letters than he was as a statesman. He published early in life a scholarly and luminous study of the Holy Roman Empire which remained until his death his best title to intellectual distinction. But his most ambitious work was his painstaking and exhaustive analysis of American political institutions and practices which he first gave to the world about twenty-five years ago. It was a work rather of industry than insight, for Lord Bryce was not alive to the true psychological and economic explanation of many American political facts, but it remains an indispensable source book of American politics during the period from 1870 to 1890. His subsequent political career was a disappointment and his dispatch to this country as ambassador was equivalent to a retirement. His last book on democracy was more of a compilation and less of an interpretation than his American Commonwealth. It was remarkable chiefly because at the end of his life he had lost some of the confidence in democracy which was responsible for his original interest in the American Republic.

OPPONENTS of the birth control movement will grasp eagerly at Dr. Copeland's analysis of the birth statistics of New York. American born mothers, although sixty percent of the total number of mothers, bear forty percent of the children. The birth rate for the foreign born is 38 per thousand; for the native born, 16, and for the most typically American district, 7 per thousand. Nor can the American mothers plead the excuse of better babies, if fewer, since they lose in the first year after birth, 90 babies per thousand as compared with 43 for Scotch mothers, 58 for Swedes, 64 for Russians. There is here, as Dr. Copeland emphasizes, an important displacement of population taking place. The older immigrant stocks are yielding to the newer. Whether this means the better yielding to the worse or vice versa is a question admitting of no conclusive answer. It will, of course, be answered dogmatically enough by those who mistake their pride of race for an impartial judgment on race values. All will agree, however, that it is a deplorable thing that any group in the American population, especially a group which has had a long experience here, should find life not worth perpetuating. But as for the birth control movement, what has that to do with it? The practice of birth control has obviously made great headway under our regime of reticence—greater headway, in fact, than in countries like Holland where it is lawful to impart birth control information. It should not be overlooked that the birth control movement has a positive as well as a negative side, as indicated in the name of one branch of the American movement, the Voluntary Parenthood League. It stands for the right of the child not to be born when life promises only disease and want, but also for its right to be born when life offers reasonable hope of happiness.

The Subversion of Public Education

THERE have long been thinkers on the continent of Europe and in England who have opposed state-conducted education. They have insisted that the state would surely use schools as a means of fixating the minds of the pupils, forming them upon the patterns of beliefs that are acceptable to political authorities. The danger is greater and the resulting outrage is worse, they hold, because pupils are of immature years and unable to protect themselves. The maintenance of liberty depends upon liberty of thought, inquiry and belief; and in preventing this liberty, state-supported education becomes the chief foe of all liberty.

Up to very recently, this view of public education has had next to no adherents in the United States. It was doctrinaire, unreal. Our public schools have had many defects but they have been genuinely public. Their office and work have been social, not political. Doubtless one set of beliefs rather than another has often been inculcated. But this was not done intentionally, of set purpose. Teachers drawn from the community have naturally reflected the views in which they were brought up, the beliefs which prevailed about them. But the influence of this fact upon teaching was unconscious and incidental. It was personal not political. It called, indeed, for care so as to select teachers who were trained to independent and critical thinking. But it afforded no basis for an accusation that the schools were agencies for propagating class ideas or beliefs favorable to vested interests.

Is this ancient and honorable state of affairs to be altered? Is the argument against state-managed schools to pass out of the region of doctrinaire theory and become a vital issue? If so,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cause is to be found among professed defenders of the public schools, not among their opponents. Mr. Lusk has been having his troubles in Albany but his soul goes crawling on in the public schools of the State of New York. The Lusk laws are part of the horrid by-products of the war. But they remain on the statute books. As long as they are there, they mean nothing more nor less than that teachers in the state-established schools of New York are servants not of society, but of the particular governmental and social order which happens to exist and of the particular economic system which happens to have secured legal recognition in the past. This is a revolution in the traditional theory and practice of American schools and it should be understood for just what it is. It is the heaviest blow which any enemy of the system of public education has ever landed upon that system. It is class-war carried into what have been the schools of all the people. The result will not harm social agitators; it is a boon to the revolutionary minded among them. It is our schools which suffer. If the American public is one-tenth as much attached to the public educational system as it professes itself to be, its aroused opinion will erase the offensive laws from the statutes at this session of the legislature.

Memories at best are short, and just now we are actively engaged in forgetting as fast we can the disagreeable features of the late war. The chief support for the continuation of these laws lies in this fact. We do not wish to be reminded of the foolish things we allowed ourselves to do: we do not want to be reminded of our ugly and excited state of mind. So it is well to recall just what the two laws are. One of them applies beyond the schools which are supported by state taxation. It refuses a license to any school "where it shall appear that the instruction proposed to be given includes the teachings of the doctrine that organized governments shall be overthrown by force, violence or unlawful means." The wording is so incredible that it needs minute examination to do it justice. Notice the word "appear"; appears to whom and by what rules of evidence? Notice the words "proposed to be given." It is not even an actual fact which is to "appear." It is a mental state, something proposed. And it applies to a "doctrine"! Who ever heard the like? The bill is so loosely drawn that it provides for revocation of a license already granted whenever it "appears" that the doctrine of the overthrow of organized government by force is taught or that "the same is being conducted in a fraudulent manner." Doubtless the intention was to revoke a license when it appears that a *school* is conducted in a fraudulent manner, but the actual wording subjects a school to revocation if it points out fraud in the conduct of a government. It is to be hoped that no instructor in the Rand School, for example, will recklessly reflect upon gifts of silver-sets to members of the legislature for sponsoring special legislation. Such reflections might suggest a fraudulent manner of conducting government.

Finally, as to the subject matter. Let it be noted that a school does not come under the ban when it "appears" that instructors teach the "doctrine" of overthrow by force of the organized government of the United States; it applies to organized governments at large. It is lucky that the bill was not passed when various professors in various private institutions in the United States were teaching the desirability of the overthrow by force of the organized government of the Kaiser. And it is to be hoped that no professors in any private institutions will henceforth give support to any future Denikins or Kolchaks who may undertake to overthrow the present somewhat highly organized government of Russia. And of course they all kept silent about the attempts of republicans in Ireland to overthrow the English government. It is doubtful if any legislature in any part of the civilized and savage world ever threw its mantle of beneficence so widely over all the governments of the world as has the New York legislature under the guidance of that great hearted internationalist, Senator Lusk. It is to be feared that President Butler is not familiar with this particular Lusk law. In his recent report he says that it is "fortunate that Columbia University . . . . is free to carry on its work beyond the reach of the deadening hand of government." If he realized that Columbia University as a private institution now comes under the deadening hand of government he would doubtless lead the movement for the repeal of the Lusk law.

The other law applies directly to the public schools. It forbids the issuing of certificates to teach to persons who are not of good moral character and to those who have not "shown satisfactorily" that they are "loyal and obedient to the government of this state and of the United States." It refuses certificates to those who have advocated—not in schools but anywhere at any time—"a form of government other than the government of the United States or of this state." This law is as narrow as the other is generous. That one forbids advocating the overthrow of any organized government; *this one makes it impossible for public school teachers to advocate any*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government but that of the United States not only for the United States but for all states. Great indeed was the wisdom of those who formed our governments, national and state. Not only is it the last word as regards our own country but it is universal in scope. The teacher must not only not have advocated a Cabinet government for the United States—as Woodrow Wilson once did—but he must not advocate anything but a congressional form of government for France and Great Britain. A sociologist recently told the American Political Science Association that practically all sociologists agree in belief that present systems of territorial representation in government should be supplemented if not supplanted by vocational or occupational representation. Let no sociologist, with this smell of Sovietism upon him, apply for a certificate to teach in the schools of New York.

The danger is that the laws will persist just because they are so ridiculous that they appear to most citizens to be mere flourishes. The Lusk laws certainly were never intended for general and impartial enforcement. But let us not deceive ourselves. Senator Lusk is on record as saying that while men and women as citizens may advocate peaceful changes in government, "they have not the right to do it while they subsist on public funds"—not even by peaceful means. The whole underlying idea is that teachers are to be intellectual and moral tools of the status quo in government; they are to be conservatives even if they have to become intellectual slaves, cowards and hypocrites. This is the real issue and not the absurdities hatched by Senator Lusk and the dark powers back of him.

In addition, the import of the law is to kill all educational independence on the part of teachers. Some machinery had to be created to carry out the provisions of the bill. The law says that school authorities shall not issue certificates until the "applicant has been examined." Clearly the Commissioner of Education is hardly going to examine in person the morality, the obedience and social teachings of every applicant. So the last Commissioner passed the buck to local school authorities, which for New York and other large cities means the principals of schools. A most outrageous inquisition was set up as an administrative measure. Principals are required to report upon every teacher under three heads: teachers whose morality and loyalty can be personally vouched for; those vouched for not personally but on information considered reliable; those who cannot be vouched for personally or upon reliable information, *or* of whose morality or loyalty the principal has reasonable doubt. Note the dastardly character of the last "or." All that any arbitrary principal has to do in order to put a teacher under suspicion is to check a teacher's name under the third category.

Fortunately war passions are fleeting. But this administrative method remains and subjects every teacher in the state to the whims, dislike and ignorance of his supervisory official. Its import, as it works out, is to make loyalty to the dictates of administrative officers the equivalent to loyalty to government. The provision is best read in the light of the testimony of the President of the New York School Board before the Lusk Committee: "I believe the law should be amended to the extent that the Board of Education of the City of New York might treat the teacher as would the *ordinary employer treat the employee.*" And in order that no doubt may be left as to the meaning of the proposed reduction of the teacher to the level of the employee of the ordinary employer, the President, Mr. Prall, went on to say that this was "instead of the legal rights" the teacher now has in his tenure of office. The old law of tenure was not changed in form. The inquisition and the power it gives to dictatorial officials is an indirect and cowardly way of accomplishing the desired result. There is a high school in New York City where the principal put in the first or preferred stock teachers who had been on the staff for two months and in the second or common stock, teachers who had been in the school for eight years. It is, of course, only a coincidence that these latter teachers had had differences of opinion of an educational and administrative sort with the principal.

But let us make no mistake. Great as the importance to the public that our schools should attract and retain men and women of character, honesty and intelligence rather than men and women who are complaisant, cowardly and colorless, there is a larger reason for the repeal of the Lusk laws than justice and encouragement to teachers. The Lusk Committee went on record in the following words: "The public school teacher is a representative and officer of the state *as it now exists.*" The teacher who "does not approve of the present social system [not merely the order of government but the whole social system be it noted] . . . . must surrender his public office." And again "no person who is not eager to combat the theories of social change should be entrusted with the task of fitting the young and old for the responsibilities of citizenship." There you have it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in black and white. Arbitrariness and dishonesty in administering the law is but a natural consequence and inevitable detail of a law which regards it as the chief function of the public school to maintain without improvements the existing social order. It is the plain duty of all who believe in our historic public school system to unite to repeal the subversive, revolutionary Lusk law.

France Contra Mundum

M. POINCARÉ'S policy as outlined in his first public statements and as overwhelmingly approved by the Chamber of Deputies contains nothing unexpected and startling. Germany must redeem every obligation she has assumed under the Treaty of Versailles. The excuses that their fulfillment is impossible or that it will work more harm than good on other countries will not avail. Default in any respect and from any cause will result in the presentation of a huge bill of penalties. They will consist first in the continued occupation by France of the Rhenish provinces, second in the administration of the finances of Germany by her creditors and third, if necessary, in the seizure by the French army of the one remaining German coal deposit and industrial centre. This program is, of course, familiar stuff. Every French premier since the signature of the Treaty of Versailles, including M. Briand, has said substantially the same thing. What a French prime minister says is not necessarily important. The question is: how much and what under the existing circumstances do his words mean?

His words mean the adoption probably by the present French government of a less conciliatory policy in dealing with its former allies than that of the last three French governments. But we doubt whether it means the invasion of the Ruhr basin by the French army. In our opinion M. Poincaré will not dare to call down on his country the most universal odium and condemnation which such an act of war would provoke. On the other hand M. Poincaré almost certainly will do what he can to inflict on Germany the other two proposed penalties for default. He undoubtedly intends to build up a legal case under the Treaty for the permanent annexation by France or separation from Germany of the Rhenish provinces, and he will insist upon compelling the German government to introduce and try to enforce drastic economies in domestic expenditure and drastic increases in taxation. The exaction now and hereafter of these penalties, which are of unimpeachable legality under the Treaty and which would not constitute an act of war such as the occupation of the Ruhr, would involve consequences similar to those which would follow from the renewed invasion of Germany. They would postpone and for the duration of the enterprise defeat the disarmament, the restoration and the appeasement of Europe. The separation of the Rhine provinces from Germany would be an offence against the peace and welfare of Europe compared to which the separation of Alsace-Lorraine from France in 1871 would be of minor importance; and the administration of German finances by a French or Franco-British commission would almost certainly result in national bankruptcy and social revolution in Germany.

If this prophecy as to the nature and limits of M. Poincaré's policy is correct, the new French government will submit an extremely embarrassing and serious question to its allies and partners in the Great War! They cannot, it is clear, allow the river of economic, social and political distress to keep on accumulating at the existing rate. A few more months of disintegration will spell disaster, not only for the whole of Europe but to a less extent for the whole of the world. The only proposed plan of dealing with this rising catastrophe which has any chance of success is the Genoa Conference, but the attitude and policy of M. Poincaré condemn this proposal in advance to utter and unavoidable futility in action. He refuses to consent to the free and thoroughgoing discussion at the conference of those political and economic problems whose existence and whose intrinsic difficulties are ruining Europe. He erects a barrier across the only road to the political and economic recovery of Europe and gives notice in the name of French national interests to former friends and enemies of France that they shall not pass. The French government is practically asking the peoples who want to pass what they are going to do about it.

What *are* they going to do about it? Ever since the armistice French fears, hatreds, susceptibilities and interests have raised insuperable obstacles to European recovery. French national egotism has not had its own way entirely, but it has prevented any more disinterested European power from prevailing, and it has succeeded in writing its own exclusive and destructive ambitions into the public law of Europe. It proposed in the beginning to frame a treaty which assumed the essential and permanent unregeneracy of the German nation,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the permanent legal canonization of France as the defender and torch-bearer of civilization, and the permanent and overwhelming military superiority of France over Germany. It demanded as appropriate means to these ends a Rhine frontier, the annexation of the Saar coal basin and an indemnity large enough to credit France with an unpayable mortgage on German economic resources and an unimpeachable legal excuse for treating Germany as a defaulter, a culprit and a victim. It did not secure the explicit alienation of the Rhine provinces and the Saar basin, but it obtained a temporary occupation which would become indefinitely prolonged in the event of any default by Germany on her impossible obligations and it secured in the reparations commission a weapon which could be used to prevent the German economic system from owning its own soul and body. The allies of France have formally and repeatedly consented to this sabotage. They have consented at times reluctantly and at times willingly; but as its consequences were revealed their reluctance has steadily increased. These consequences have now waxed intolerable and monstrous. M. Poincaré is hammering on the door of Europe with the hilt of the sword and demanding the pound of flesh which they have promised to France for the healing of the French wounds. But as the nations now realize this pound of flesh which France is supposed to want is situated not only close to the heart of Germany but also close to the heart of Europe. What *are* they going to do about it?

In the past they have systematically humored French susceptibilities and yielded so far as possibe to French exactions. They have compared France to a violated woman who is hysterical over her grievances and who may lose her self-control unless she is soothed and petted. France has, of course, a terrible grievance against Germany which has unsettled her composure; and from the pathological condition she will some time recover. But under what treatment will she recover most quickly and most completely? Her allies and friends have during three years tried the remedial effect of humoring and sympathizing with her and of compromising with her disastrous demands, but instead of being appeased her politicians have labored to write her grievances, her apprehensions and her illusions into the fundamental law of Europe. She has taken advantage of their sympathy and good nature to build up for herself a sound legal title to an intolerably privileged position in the European economy and politics. The policy of the French government is itself chiefly responsible for the inability of Germany at this moment to satisfy the legitimate French demands for reparation. Yet because Germany cannot pay, M. Poincaré proposes for the supposed benefit of France to hold up the recovery of all Europe.

The policy of petting and humoring France has failed. Surely the time has finally come for reversing it. Her associates in the Great War in the interest of their own salvation will have to tell her considerately but firmly that, if she insists on ruining Europe, Europe will have to combine against her. They will have to serve notice that, if the present French government behaves as it threatens to behave, they will publicly condemn its conduct as unfriendly and inimical to the common welfare. They have always dreaded and avoided an open breach of this kind. They have always feared that it might provoke French nationalism to use its existing military preponderance in some abortive but terribly costly invasion of Germany. It may provoke this result, but they will have to take the risk. The policy of the Poincaré government will, if carried out, complete the ruin of Europe in one way or another—that is, either by seizing the industrial heart of Germany and stopping its throbs or by throwing the German government into bankruptcy and the German people into despair and revolution. But if French nationalism is to complete the ruin of Europe in any event, it is better for the ruin to take place in spite of the protest rather than with the consent of the former associates of France. Probably, however, the protest, if considerately expressed, if undertaken with substantial unanimity and if accompanied by a renewed offer of the guarantees arranged at Cannes, would in the end discredit M. Poincaré and cause the downfall of his government and the reversal of his policy.

There now exists in M. Briand a leader who seeks a fair adjustment between France and the rest of Europe. His return to power depends both upon the failure of the policy of irresponsible and isolated coercion and upon the declared attitude of the rest of Europe towards that failure. If Briand and his party are to come back, the associates of France must take care not to ruffle unnecessarily French susceptibilities, but they must also arouse the French nation to an understanding of the perilous position into which it has arrived as a consequence of its policy of the last three years. These are grim times in which the lives and happiness of millions of people are at stake. If France continues to block the way out, it will be the worse for France and the French people should know it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Representation on the Reserve Board

THERE is grave concern among American leaders of finance over the success of the agricultural bloc in forcing President Harding to agree to its demand that a place be made on the Federal Reserve Board for a representative of the agricultural interests. The inclusion of a farmer would perhaps exert no immediate effect upon the policies of the Board. But if a farmer is to have a place, why not also a representative of labor, asks the Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve Board in a memorandum submitted to President Harding on January 12th? Why not a merchant, a manufacturer, an exporter?

The question is pertinent. We really cannot imagine that the constitution of the board will be finally settled with the injection of one farmer into a group of bankers. An embarrassed administration, seeking party harmony at all costs, may intend nothing more than a sop to Cerberus. But Cerberus has more heads than one, and is not to be appeased once for all. Other interests are bound sooner or later to seize upon the precedent and demand representation. The Advisory Council obviously feel that there is nothing at all to be said on the side of such representation by interests. They consider that by raising the question they have answered it. We have the greatest respect for the opinion of the Advisory Council on a technical matter of finance. Nevertheless, the issue appears to us decidedly an open one.

What is the nature of the function of the Federal Reserve Board, and of the Federal Reserve system which it heads? Is it nothing but the administration of the common interests of the banks? Then there is room on the board only for bankers and experts in banking. There would even be a question whether the sectional representation now admitted in the personnel of the board was desirable. Men should be selected for it exclusively with a view to their training, intelligence, energy, integrity.

But nobody, we believe, conceives the functions of the board so narrowly. The Advisory Council do not. "The Board," they write, "like a court of supreme standing, must be able to act from an entirely judicial point of view, uninfluenced by the wishes of parties or classes, but seeking to fashion its policies with the sole aim of serving the best advantage of the country as a whole." The Board, does, then, have a policy-making function. In that it is not analogous to "a court of supreme standing," which, theoretically at least, only interprets and enforces the will of the sovereign, whether of the people behind the Constitution or of the legislature. The Federal Reserve Board is more like the Interstate Commerce Commission than like the Supreme Court. Its business is to protect the interests both of the banks and of the business community, to effect compromises when a conflict emerges. Is it then such a preposterous idea that the various business interests should be represented on it, along with the banks? In theory, we hasten to add, since we have no ready-made plan of business representation to offer.

We shall be lectured, no doubt, by those who believe that the interests of the banking system and those of business are at all times identical. It is perfectly true that banking and business must prosper or suffer depression together. But this general rule does not establish an absolute identity of interests. Still less does it establish the superior competency of the bankers to take counsel for the common interest. We can conceive of conditions in which the general interest of business demands easier credit, in spite of certain attendant risks, while the interest of the banks urges restriction of credit in order better to insure solvency. We can conceive of conditions in which the community of manufacturers, merchants and farmers have a sense of buoyancy as of an approaching boom, while the community of bankers feel leaden and pessimistic. In such conditions, a compromise policy might well be beneficial to the public.

And even granting that serious divergence of views would rarely occur in practice, is there not much to be said for the effect upon public opinion of the business representation principle? The Federal Reserve Board has already come in for a vast volume of criticism, most of it, we believe, unfounded. It has been criticized for yielding to inflationist tendencies during the war and immediately after. It did yield, but it could probably not have resisted those tendencies, however much it might have deserved to do so. This is the Advisory Council's opinion, and we concur in it.

But the severest criticism of the board has been directed against the part it played, or was supposed to have played, in post-war deflation. It is the fixed conviction of hundreds of thousands of farmers that the board was responsible for the deflation of agricultural prices. Nothing else fell in price so promptly, or so disastrously. How can this be explained, demands the farmer, except as the result of a withdrawal of credits which forced the throwing on the market of stocks that otherwise might have been doled out gradually? The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federal Reserve Board has, we believe, a perfectly good defence. It did not engineer the withdrawal of credits from agriculture. On the contrary, its influence was exerted to check a too rapid deflation. If the board had consisted exclusively of farmers, we should still be suffering from agricultural depression. But let anyone who can, convince the farmer of this.

The policies of the board, however impartially intended, will seem to work good or evil for the various business groups in the community. Why not let these groups share the responsibility?

Why Conferences Rather Than the League?

IN a letter published elsewhere in this issue Professor Manley O. Hudson enters certain objections to a statement made recently in the New Republic that "the new association of nations proposed by Messrs. Harding and Hughes will possess a decisive advantage over the League of Nations," because "the League of Nations is still bound hand and foot by the instrument, the Treaty of Versailles, which created it." These objections deal in part with the legal relationship between the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations and in part with the relationship which the League of Nations can occupy to the problem of European reconstruction as compared with the relationship which some alternative association of nations can occupy to the same problem. About the objections which Mr. Hudson urges under the first heading there is no occasion for controversy. From the point of view of the legal relationship between the Treaty and the League it may have been misleading to declare that the League was bound hand and foot by the Treaty; but the quotation was not occupied with the legal relationship between the League and the Treaty. It was occupied primarily with the availability of the League, compared with an alternative association of nations, as a possible agency of European reconstruction and of changes which reconstruction will demand in the Treaty of Versailles. All that Mr. Hudson says about the legal relationship between the League and the Treaty may be and is true. Yet it may also be true that as a matter of practical politics the League is bound hand and foot by the Treaty.

Mr. Hudson's objections under the second heading raise a more important group of questions which deserve candid consideration. In his opinion any association of nations which included France, Great Britain and Italy would be bound by the Treaties of Versailles and Saint Germain just as much as the League of Nations is, and if it is important to revise those treaties he sees "no reason for thinking that revision could be accomplished more easily in an 'association' than in the League." The significant difference of opinion between the New Republic and Mr. Hudson concerns these statements. We dissent from both of them.

That France, Great Britain, Japan and Italy would remain bound by the Treaties, no matter whether they were acting as part of the League of Nations or an alternative conference of nations is manifestly true, but it is far from conclusive in relation to the present issue. For in the League of Nations they associate almost exclusively with other nations which have either signed the Treaty of Versailles or are not concerned with its modification; and among a group of governments which are to such a large extent bound by the same stipulations, it is difficult almost to the point of impossibility to revise any provision of the Treaty which is possible of execution. As Mr. Hudson points out, some revision has taken place, but it has taken place only in relation to clauses which are exhausted by their own intrinsic absurdity or inutility. The pressure for revision must come from nations which have not signed the Treaty of Versailles or have signed it unwillingly, and those nations are for the present divorced from the League and must seek an alternative method of obtaining the benefits of international association. A conference called by the United States which is not a member of the League of Nations and has not signed the Treaty of Versailles could provide an occasion and an excuse for reconsidering the alienation of Shantung from China, but China which is a member of the League could not have obtained a reconsideration of the decision from members of the League Council which had already given their consent to Japanese occupation. France, Great Britain, Italy and Japan are reluctant to modify the Treaty except as the result of pressure from powerful nations which are not legally bound by its provisions or do not feel themselves morally bound. Such nations can exercise that pressure more effectively through a freer and more flexible association of nations than through the existing League.

Consider the case of the United States. The future welfare of the American people depends to a considerable extent upon the restoration to Europe of political sanity and economic health. One essential condition of restoration is a modification of the Treaty of Versailles. The only possible agency of modification, except another

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, is a conference of nations. What, then, should an American statesman who accepted the truth of these propositions do in order to bring into existence a conference which is willing and able to revise the Treaty? Join the League of Nations? But the League of Nations now excludes those peoples which possess the soundest reasons for wishing to have the Treaties revised; and it can only operate through a constitutional mechanism which places formidable legal obstacles in the path of restoring Germany and Russia to an equal citizenship in the society of nations. Surely under such conditions it is wiser to ignore the League and to try and call into existence for the revision of the Treaty and the resettlement of Europe a new agency of conference which does not suffer from such embarrassing traces of the political and moral atmosphere which prevailed in Paris in the spring of 1919.

As a matter of fact this is precisely the way in which at least one eminent European statesman is to all appearances now reasoning. Owing to the initiative of Mr. Lloyd George there may assemble early in the spring at Genoa a new conference. The Supreme Council proposed this conference for the purpose of trying to reach an agreement among all the important European nations about the reconstruction and resettlement of Europe. If the League of Nations had been as available for this purpose as Mr. Hudson thinks it is, Mr. Lloyd George would naturally have called the mechanism of the League to his assistance. When there is a society of nations in existence organized particularly to promote international cooperation, it would be natural to use it at a time like the present when international animosities and quarrels are steadily undermining social order. But Mr. Lloyd George did not apparently even consider the use of the League mechanism. It was more possible to obtain for Germany and Russia an invitation to a European conference and to admit them to such a conference as equals than it was to get them into the League of Nations as equals of France and Great Britain. The second course would involve a prolonged delay and controversy about their admission to the advantages and responsibilities of the League. The organization of that body raises serious obstacles against the admission to its counsels of any other nations on an equality with the victors in the war. It was constructed deliberately for the purpose of perpetuating the victory of the Allies in the constitution of the society of nations.

If and when any satisfactory European settlement, based upon the free consent of the Russian and German peoples as well as on the consent of the British, French, Italian and the smaller peoples, takes place, the League of Nations, modified in order to admit Germany and Russia into the Council may and probably will supply this mechanism of future cooperation; but for the present the practical impossibility of getting them into the Council of the League on a parity with the other great European powers disqualifies the League from playing an important part in the reconstruction of Europe. The advocates of the League in this country have always attributed the want of moral authority on the part of the League to the defection of the United States. We do not agree with them. The League has lacked moral authority chiefly because its constitution was unfaithful to its own formative principle of obligatory general conference. The wholly insufficient provision for the future admission of Russia and Germany amounting to practical exclusion deprived the League of the kind of authority which it needs to realize its own higher efficiency. The constitution of the League should have recognized the right of the German and Russian people to be consulted by arranging for the inclusion of their governments and as members of the Council with the fewest possible preliminary conditions and formalities. Instead it made the admission of Germany depend in practice upon the fulfillment of the terms of an impossible treaty; and in place of encouraging Russian participation by a standing invitation to come in upon definite and possible terms, it did nothing to recognize her right to be consulted about the future of Europe. That is why the League is bound by the Treaty of Versailles and why Mr. Lloyd George, when he seeks by conference to bring about European recovery and appeasement with German and Russian consent, ignores the League of Nations.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1922, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER; DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY ALVIN JOHNSON
FRANCIS HACKETT PHILIP LITTELL
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
ROBERT LITTELL, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An American Transportation System

1. Railroads

NO statement would find more universal concurrence than this: "There is something the matter with our railroad system." Everyone concurs because each of us, in some form and in some degree, experiences the deterioration of American transportation and the slackening effect upon our industrial and commercial life. The trouble with our railroad system is that we have no railroad system.

You can pick up your telephone in Manhattan and call anyone in any borough of the city, in any city of the state, in any state of the union. That is system. But if you in Manhattan have a box of freight to go forward by the Pennsylvania, one by the New York Central, one by the D. L. & W., you cannot put those boxes on a truck and deliver them to the nearest freight station. Your truck must call at the Pennsylvania station and deliver one box, then travel to the New York Central station and deliver a second box, then travel to the D. L. & W. station and deliver the third. That is not system.

As a matter of fact, if you want your boxes all forwarded today, you must go to still greater expense than sending a truck peddling parcels to separate railroad freight stations. The truck would be held up so long waiting to deliver at the congested Pennsylvania station that it would get to the New York Central after closing hours. So you must send three trucks, one to each railroad station, each truck with one box of freight. That still less is system.

If you travel on the Pennsylvania, you comfortably take your train at Thirty-second Street and Seventh Avenue. If you travel on the Jersey Central, you must ferry across the Hudson to Communipaw. If your destination lies on the West Shore, you reach your train by ferry to faraway Weehawken. The D. L. & W. and Erie will carry you, but first cross the river to the Jersey shore. That is not system. Before long we shall look back with amazement at a New York City administration that let the Pennsylvania build in Manhattan alone and left the others marooned across the Hudson. Of course some day they will come over to us but it will be at a cost for real estate and construction work far greater than if they and the Pennsylvania had been brought in together, and the convenience to the public will be far less. It is not system.

The most valuable waterfront in the world, the most sought after by steamship lines, is the Manhattan waterfront on the Hudson River from Sixtieth Street to the Battery. Most people think that steamship lines use these piers. By no means. More than half the piers are used by the railroads, which, terminating across the river, deliver cars to Manhattan by putting them on car floats and barging them alongside Manhattan piers. Cars thus standing on car floats are unloaded on the floor of the pier, which serves as an inward freight station. The empty car is then loaded with outward freight received at the adjacent bulkhead (or quay) shed.

One railroad acquires a pier on the lower Hudson river waterfront of Manhattan. Every other road feels that it must immediately acquire a pier (a freight station) in the immediate neighborhood, in order to compete for the business of nearby shippers. A road gets a pier in the Canal Street section of the West Side water front. Every other road squanders its revenues to acquire and equip a pier station right there. So with the Twenty-third Street section, the Forty-second Street section, the lower East Side water front.

An air-plane view shows the Manhattan water front to be a floating railroad yard. The space between piers, where vessels should be berthing, holds solid masses of car floats. Steamship companies cannot successfully bid for these pier locations in competition with railroads, who will stake any sum to gain a terminal advantage over their rivals. So the steamships, even passenger lines, are driven to accept distant berths in South Brooklyn or Staten Island. Railroad cars that can be unloaded on dry land are allowed to monopolize the choicest locations on the water. That is not system.

A new industrial section developed in a Middle Western city which was served by five railroads. Each road extended its line to that section and there constructed and maintained at least a freight house, team tracks and a car storage yard. To the greatest possible extent each road sought side track connection with each industry. A single branch line could have been built to that section, a line owned jointly by all five rail carriers and connecting with each of them. The joint line could have served all industrial side tracks for all the owning roads. For all carriers jointly a single freight station could have been maintained, with one staff of employees.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Instead, the city has grown up around five branch lines, cluttering it and crossing its streets. The shippers in the new industrial section must deal with five freight stations instead of one. The annual cost of providing railroad service to this section—interest, taxes, maintenance, and operation—is several times larger than it needs to be, not five times perhaps, but certainly three times larger.

The situation is typical of what has happened and what is happening all over the country. Multiply many times the figures which express the waste and loss involved in the railroad service of that Middle Western city and you get a conception of what railroad competition in terminal service is costing the country. It is not system.

The carriers have invested in them something like nineteen billion dollars. The moderate return of six percent on this investment would require a net of over eleven hundred million dollars annually. In 1920 the carriers earned nothing. In 1921 the preliminary figures show a net, but examination discloses that this net was earned because an abnormally small amount was spent upon maintenance and equipment. If 1921 had spent as much upon maintenance of equipment as 1920 there would have been no 1921 net. The railroads' financial problem is as far from being solved as it was when the government relinquished the carriers.

With the disappearance of railroad net earnings, capital is closed to the railroad industry. For a decade men and institutions controlling investment funds have observed the falling or omitted returns on railroad stocks and bonds. These investment interests have therefore put their money into industrials; they lend no more to the unprofitable carriers. The roads, thus cut off from a continuing capital supply, are deprived of the nourishment on which to grow or even maintain themselves. They have been suffering from progressive undernutrition that is unfitting them to serve us now, to say nothing of expanding to serve our future needs.

Railroad net revenue is the difference between gross revenue and expense. We know now that the solution of the problem of the railroads does not lie in increasing their gross revenue by rate advances; for we have tried it repeatedly since 1917, most recently in the 25 percent rate advance of 1918 and the 40 percent rate advance of 1920. The railroads meanwhile have gone from bad to worse. When rates are too high, they defeat their own purpose, for traffic does not move. It is too much to say that inordinate rate advances are the main cause for the business stagnation of today. Nevertheless there are railroad officials who say that even if in other respects business conditions were more nearly normal there would be a large volume of former traffic that would not move under the present rates. They are "more than the traffic can bear." Railroad gross revenues will profit from a reduction rather than an advance in rates.

It is by scaling down the expenses of the railroads that they will be saved. Thus far the main attempt has been to reduce wage expenses. But the enormous savings necessary are not being found in that direction. The Railroad Labor Board did cancel part of the wage advance of 1920. It found some working rules entailed unjust hardships and expense on the carriers. It found them burdened with unnatural wages for unskilled workers improperly classified as skilled during the Railroad Administration. Wages of some classes of common labor are still too high in the railroad industry. The progressive elimination of these wage injustices inherited from government ownership is providing expense reductions insignificant compared with what the carriers require. Railroad wages as a whole are not unjustly high compared with the increase in the cost of living or compared with the wages earned by similarly skilled workmen outside the railroad business. The roads must continue to pay liberally enough to attract to themselves a proper share of the skill and brains of the country.

Two-thirds of the railroad expenses are paid out for terminal services. It is a strange fact that in this most important field of railroad outgo, only the faintest beginning has been made in the direction of savings through consolidating terminal operations.

Take for example the illustration already given, of the five separate railroads serving an industrial section of a Middle Western city. Suppose we forbid the railroad carriers there to continue competitive services and compel them to unify. The result would be the abandonment of four branch lines and four stations, and the development of the best station and the best line to a capacity sufficient for all roads. The valuable real estate set free by the abandonment of duplicate lines and stations could now be sold and the proceeds returned to the railroads, which would henceforth be freed of the annual burden of interest, maintenance and operation of the relinquished property. Multiply such savings by the number of cities served by competitive railroads and the result would be an indication of the reduction in expense possible from unified railroad terminal operations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Would the shippers benefit? Certainly. An industrial location on a neutralized terminal line connecting with all carriers is preferable to a location on the line of a single carrier.

The question asks itself: Why in the world do not the railroads themselves see the possibilities of such reductions in expenses? Why need they be forced to undertake these innovations so obviously to their own advantage?

Return to the illustration of the Middle Western city. There will never be voluntary unification of service for that industrial section because all carriers will not join. The two roads which reached the section first, pre-empted the choicest, most convenient location for freight stations, and have spur track connections with the largest number of industrial plants. These roads figure that under the present "system" they get a far larger proportion of the total freight of the district than if they threw their facilities into a common pool and took the same service as the other roads. The three carriers having inferior locations with respect to this district, would probably welcome joint terminal operations here. But in other cities some of the same three roads were the first on hand. They there hold the best terminal facilities. The under dog in one place becomes the dog-in-the-manger in another.

Since one road is ahead in the race for terminal location in one city, another road in another city, no road has gained by the sums poured into competitive terminals. Advantages and disadvantages offset each other. Consolidation of terminals would have little effect upon the distribution of traffic among the roads. Each carrier would share in the total traffic in proportion to its car supply and the transportation service it can render—and these are approximately the basis determining the apportionment of tonnage today.

The inconvenience occasioned to the shipping public by the multiplicity of Manhattan freight stations of individual railroads, has been indicated. Drayage costs between shipper and railroad stations have risen so as to drive many an industry away from Manhattan. The solution of offering joint freight stations with improved service between these stations and the Jersey terminal yards, did not occur to the carriers. They knew nothing of cooperation in terminal facilities.

It took an outsider to show the railroads what they might have done. Mr. Irving Bush, observing the punitive drayage cost on Manhattan, built a group of loft buildings in South Brooklyn, the Bush Terminal, and invited Manhattan shippers to locate there. He had himself made terminal agent for all railroads, maintaining connection wth them by car float. He abolished drayage. His tenant pushes a shipment into the Bush freight elevator and gets the bill of lading to destination. The elevator drops down to the ground floor, which is a shipping platform on which cars are loaded and forwarded to the trunk line railroads.

The railroads could have done that themselves on Manhattan. Ten years ago Calvin Tomkins, Dock Commissioner, showed the roads how to do it. He planned an elevated freight railroad along West Street, the waterfront street on the Hudson River. This elevated would be reached by the Jersey carriers through a tunnel under the river; the New York Central would reach it direct from its Manhattan yard. The elevated road would give access to a large number of freight stations inland from the waterfront, and the railroads could then release piers for steamship use. Above each union freight station would be built several stories of loft buildings for warehouse and manufacturing use with freight elevators and shipping advantages precisely as at the Bush Terminal. But the rail carriers with more and better located pier stations would not listen to this Tomkins plan.

That it was sound was demonstrated by the New York Central, which in 1916 proposed to spend over $50,000,000 in building such an elevated road down the island of Manhattan a block back from the Hudson River waterfront. It was a duplicate of the Tomkins plan except that it was to be for the New York Central alone. The Jersey carriers refused to be interested in participating when that was suggested by the city. Eventually the city authorities wisely refused the New York Central permission to make the improvement alone. So our railroads stuck to the antiquated methods of handling Manhattan freight at pier stations which were incapable of expansion with the growth of the city. Hence the congestion at these stations, worse every year.

It is necessary to recognize that in these matters the carriers are constitutionally incapable not only of seeing where the public advantage lies, but where their own advantage lies. Legislative abolition of competitive terminal facilities and services is needed to save the railroads from themselves, just as they were saved from themselves by the laws forbidding rebates, through which the carriers had been giving away (to favored shippers) a considerable portion of the revenue they took in.

We have no railroad system. We must have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one, for our own industrial and commercial development, and for the salvation of the carriers. In one direction Congress has seen the planlessness of American railroad building and has taken steps to correct it insofar as it is capable of correction. The 1920 Transportation act authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to plan the consolidation of our railroad lines into a number of great systems. Such consolidations, besides assuring the customary advantages that come from doing business in larger units, will put the feeble orphans of the transportation world under the protection of the stronger roads which should have fathered them in the first place. But such consolidation, even when worked out by the Interstate Commerce Commission and even when made obligatory on the carriers, will be incomparably less important for both the carriers and the public than compulsory consolidation of terminals.

In New York this would mean the creation of a new terminal company, owned jointly by the carrying roads. The terminal company would purchase from the carriers all their terminal lines, stations, equipment. The terminal company would take charge of the delivery of all freight in the district. Railroads would deliver inbound cars to the terminal company's belt line, a continuous road intersecting the terminal yards of every carrier in New Jersey and New York. The terminal company would consolidate freight movements, abandon duplicate and unnecessary lines and facilities, develop union freight stations, promote the welfare of the public and of the carriers unhindered by the rivalries and the jealousies of the carriers themselves. Similar companies would do the same in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago and in every first class city of the country. Once the system gets started the roads will demand it in the second class cities as well.

The effect on shippers will be the same as when two or three telephone companies in a town are unified into a single system. The effect on the railroads will be that experienced by a man stopping a very large hole in his money pocket.

We have no American railroad system. The lack of system makes itself most severely felt in the planlessness and inconvenience of competitive railroad facilities in our large cities and in the enormous expenses that these duplicate terminals impose on the rail carrier. The solution of the rail problem lies not in pursuing the chimaeras of higher rates and lower wages, but in cutting out this vast terminal waste.

EDWIN J. CLAPP.

Deported

IN a third-class coach of the London express, an Englishman—son of the imperturbable race—was talking himself into a fine passion. I happened to be among his involuntary listeners. In the course of his harangue he repeatedly pointed his thumb at two young girls, who had stumbled into the coupé under the weight of their wicker trunk, just before the train pulled out of Plymouth. Now they sat staring at the speaker whom they evidently could not understand. Everyone was looking them over with sympathy and curiosity.

"From Serbia," cried the Englishman, "from Serbia all the way to New York and then—deported! Think of it, the effort, the expense, the disappointment of it—deported because the quota was full! And they have been torn away from their mother, young and stupid and scared as they are. Poor things! Now just watch them—" He turned to the older girl, who was barely twenty, a pensive, rather sullen looking person with blunt Slavic features and very beautiful eyes.

"Going to Danzig?" he shouted, as though volume of tone could make her understand the unknown tongue. She shrank a little, looked at him helplessly, and surrendered her ticket.

"You see, she doesn't know. She's being sent to London—I wonder why."

The train rolled through the smiling Devonshire landscape, and the two girls grew momentarily tenser with fear of the Unknown Land. Presently the increased rumbling speed of the train and the pitying scrutiny of their fellow-passengers unnerved them and they began to weep, quietly and desperately. We were at a loss. The curse of Babel put an insurmountable barrier between them and us.

Then by some chance remark passed behind wet handkerchiefs, we discovered that they talked German. I spoke a few words, and their faces brightened wonderfully at the familiar sound.

"Who is taking care of you here in England?" I asked.

"There is a man on the train who buys our tickets, but he cannot speak to us."

"Do you know where you are going?"

"No, not at all."

That was certainly true. They proved to be quite innocent of geographical knowledge, and learned with dismay that England was an island, that it did not border upon Serbia, and that they were going north instead of south.

We talked of many things, and gradually their story became coherent.

Käthe and Anna Focht, as they called themselves, had been Austrian Jugoslavs until their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

native town of Versec, in the great European kaleidoscope, had become a part of Serbia. They had been well-off and happy in Versec; then the great wars and revolutions had brought famine and high taxes, and had cast such a shadow over the old life, such doubt upon the future, that they had dreamt and talked of the Promised Land, where peace and plenty abounded—.

They got their passports, and had them viséd by the American consul. Mother Focht and five children started upon the great adventure, secure in the power of their passports—for what could befall them while those official Papers were correct?

The first thing that befell was a week of detention on Ellis Island. It was somewhat worse than the steerage trip had been—they waited, not knowing for what. Then they heard rumors that another Paper had been signed and sealed with their fate: Mother and the three younger children should enter, but with them the immigration quota was full—Käthe and Anna were to be deported!

"They kept us two more weeks," said Anna with a shudder. "It was awful then, because there was no hope, nothing to make us bear the filthy sickly life in those barracks. There were so many of us that we almost starved. Every day some one died of disease or broken heart, and many of the women went mad. We can never forget it, not if we live a hundred years! It was for that we came across the sea—and now they have signed a Paper, saying we must go back to Versec."

What they should do in Versec, or who should receive and protect them there, the Paper did not say.

"Our home is sold," she continued, "we have sold our house, our furniture, our mattresses and cloaks and all our things. We are told to go home, and there will be no home. We must live upon the kind mercy of neighbors." She glanced at her shabby black skirt and blue jacket. A ragged silk kerchief, originally crimson and gold and deeply fringed, still covered her head, and was the only remnant of some gorgeous Balkan costume, her old mark of rank in Jugoslavia.

"And we have no mother!" she cried suddenly, overcome by this greatest grievance. "We could bear everything, if they only had not taken her away! We shall never see her again. And we have never been away from her before—we are young and helpless and cannot speak to anyone. What will these strange men do to us before we come to Versec? What shall we do among them all without mother? We cannot even write to her, because we will never know where she lives, and she will not write because she does not believe we shall ever see Versec again. O why did they send just us away, who are so unprotected?"

I tried to explain to her naïve intelligence the necessity of our immigration law,and the impossibility of considering individuals among such a multitude of people. She nodded patiently, convinced of her fate.

Käthe, who had been staring silently out of the window, pushed back her kerchief and turned scornful eyes on me.

"The Law is the Law," she said. "We know it. But this I will ask the American consul in a later life: why did he visé our passports at all, when it was forbidden to enter? Did he not know how many passports he had already seen, and how many could enter every month?"

I could not answer her question. I can only repeat it for myself: why are these people ever allowed to come? Why are passports approved that can be of no use? Why are heads counted in New York instead of abroad at the American consulates? Many a human destiny hangs on this little awkwardness of the immigration system.

America, that is the Promised Land at some time to all the oppressed of the world, stands thus in many memories as the Gate of Sorrows. Poor dreamers, can no one warn them of the fate that may await them? There seems to be absolutely no reason why they should be allowed to sell their all, to go upon the venture perfectly secure in the power of their passports, and return again destitute, penniless, some of them mere children taken from the protection of their parents. They go back to live upon charity, who once have worn kerchiefs of crimson and gold!

What shall the American consuls, or we who stand behind their signatures, answer these plaintiffs in a later life? SUSANNE K. LANGER.

Doppelgänger

I'm waiting for myself, sitting up too late
Waiting for myself to come back tonight.
I saw myself go out of a moonlit gate
And turn to the right . . .
I saw myself, a midge on the silver face
Of the moon, trudge up the sky,
And through the molten silver and fine-spun lace
Of clouds, go by.
I saw myself come to that misty house
On the other side of nowhere, where you are.
Discreetly hidden under whispering boughs
It gleams like a star.
The door glowed open. "Oh, it's you!" you said . . .
So I sit here waiting—with Fate—
And I wish Myself would get back
For I ought to go to bed
And he stays so late!

WILLIAM ROSE BENÉT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Peace and Billie Burke

I WENT to a peace meeting one night last week. I went because it was less expensive than the opera, and more promising than calling on my mother.

I rather expected an audience of men with unclipped locks falling back on undusted coat collars, and women with determined-looking clothes. I don't know why I expected this. I see now that an objection to being shot at by a complete stranger, probably at the command of a second lieutenant, can exist side by side with taking thought to one's raiment.

I see my mistake as I enter and glance about. It is the sort of audience one finds at any good theatre, say of a Saturday night. And there is a sprinkling of women whose faces still bear the restraining marks of anxiety, of uncertainty, of the vicarious suffering of women who sit at home and wait for their men to come back. Here and there is a man who looks as though war were not an interesting mental abstraction to him, because he has rotted in the wet fields of Flanders and starved and sweated in the trenches of France. And in the seat next me sits a young man in uniform, with an empty sleeve. It occurs to me that of us all, he has the most right to be here; the most right to an opinion on peace. He has paid for that right with an arm.

Someone is speaking. I have no program and the young man with the empty sleeve whispers the speaker's name to me and adds that he is the head of a workers' college. The speaker is gaunt, patient and awkward. He looks rather like Lincoln when he was young and had not yet been disillusioned by mankind. He is reading figures on the war, from a slip of paper in his hand.

Figures are usually ineffective. They do not bite into the imagination. These are appalling.

He reads that ten million young men, the hope and promise of the world, lie buried on the battlefields of France and Belgium. Ten million women had borne them in travail and agony, had reared them with infinite labor and love, as though for some great purpose . . . . to this end. . . .

He tells us that another fifteen million are bitter and awful remnants of men—eyeless, maimed, crippled, with broken bodies.

He reads on, that of every dollar paid in taxes, ninety-seven cents goes to pay for wars—past, present and to come. This in a year when three million men go begging for work as one begs for a great boon, and their children go breadless to school.

. . .

A spectacled young rabbi follows him and talks like a prophet out of the Old Testament, grown ironic. He points out mordantly that the very men who led the armies in war, are now in Washington to talk peace. That war falls most terribly on the common man; and yet that not one representative of labor, from any land, is present. Briand—he goes on—says that Germany is not yet morally disarmed. Does he mention that France is still immorally armed?

Briand is at a discount this evening; the point is tremendously applauded.

He closes on a note of: "This last 'war to end war' has given us an unparalleled and terrible harvest of present and future wars. It is not time now for a 'peace to end war'?"

I sit thinking this over.

A speaker whose name I do not catch, and who must be a chemist or else has an uncanny familiarity with chemical formulae, tells us that the next war will be a "chemical war." Where a company has been wiped out in the last war, newly discovered gasses will wipe out a regiment in the next war—a regiment, a town, an entire countryside—there seems no limit to its deadly potentialities. He reads us formulae to prove it, innocuous, pallid letters and figures. It is terrible to think that these harmless sounds have, translated into reality, implicit in them the power to make mangled masses of swiftly decaying flesh of men who, a minute before, had been instinct with youth, with hope, with pride of the flesh.

. . .

A Japanese woman sits on the platform, sober and remote in her kimona of black and silver, her wrists crossed over one another in her lap, her feet parallel and motionless in their white sandals and stockings, divided at the great toe. She looks very tired and sad and a little bored. She belongs to a race so old that it has learned to deal with realities. Our hopes and enthusiasms are immaturities to her. They are the idealisms of little children, for whom every ogre must be killed and every story end happily.

Her cool aloofness angers me. Of course the speakers were right! A peace to end war? Surely we were in sight of it even now! Had not our "war to save democracy" disillusioned us? Surely it isn't possible to lead men to the shambles forever, driven victims of greed or of geographic expediencies? Were we not, even now, a chastened people, wiser, maturer, more thoughtful, clearer-eyed? Yes, we had seen our last war! I was sure of it. The rapt, devoted faces of the speakers assured me of it; the passionate response of the audience; their eager, affirming applause. . . .

. . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We emptied out into the street. The cold lucidity of the night wind woke me. Crowds poured out of the theatre opposite. Billie Burke was playing there, perennially charming and indefatigably youthful in the perennially feather-weight play. A typical "Billie Burke audience"—too expensive-looking, too jewelled, too heavily powdered. They stood under the striped awning, impatiently waiting for their motors. Men had been sitting in the exposed front seats of their cars for three hours, in the shrewd cold, that these people might be spared a minute's wait. These people took it as fitting, inevitable and natural. So did their chauffeurs, pinched with cold.

"Where do we go from here, dearie?" asked a heavy, blue-jowled man of a woman in an ermine wrap, a bandeau of improbable roses on her impossibly golden hair. "Oh, same old stuff—Folies or the Royale. Anything to keep from yawning my head off. Some show—*not*!"

"And I said, if that's the best hooch you've got, I'm off this joint for life," said a tall, red-cheeked youngster who looked as if he ought to be at Yale finishing his Junior year. "Let's go to that Forty-third street dump. I hear they've got some of the good old stuff there yet."

A very erect, gray-headed, immaculately-tailored man who looked like one of the Captains of Industry one sees in cigarette advertisements and never anywhere else, was explaining to a friend with the indignation of conscious and outraged virtue: "So I told him that option would cost him exactly $25,000, and a little extra bonus for us of $1,000 for every week he took to make up his mind. Pretty lucky that leak tipped us off to just how badly he needed the stuff. Got him about where we want him now, I fancy!". . .

Ah well, that was that! The war hadn't done so very much to us after all . . . outside of those ten million dead. . . .

We'd go on as we had before, preying, being preyed on . . . blind, greedy. It was what they counted on, those others, who led us as they willed.

Only . . . . I wished she hadn't looked so terribly certain of it, that Japanese woman. Surely, it was something to have hoped for a better world and to have believed in it . . . . if only for a moment. . . .?

DOROTHÉE RAËL MEIROWSKY.

Lloyd George and the Ides of March

HE loves me, he loves me not—as I write, the General Election, long expected, is "on"; tomorrow it may be "off"; by the time this reaches you, which is about the time when Mr. Lloyd George is expected back in England from Cannes, it may be "on" again. The stage is set for a February election; the date that governments have to bear in mind is the end of the financial year in March and the necessity of bringing in a budget. There has been no official announcement, nor a single word direct from the Premier. But about the time he went to Cannes the prophets and correspondents who are in touch with Downing Street began to say with one accord that a dissolution had been decided on and no one has ventured to contradict them beyond saying that one or two very important Conservative leaders are opposed to an election.

That, however, is not a contradiction at all. It rests with the Premier to advise the King to dissolve Parliament. Whether he does so in spite of the opposition of Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the Tory leader, and the public protests of Sir George Younger, the chief of the Tory machine, depends on his electoral calculations. Of these we can already guess the outline. The question for the last three years has been whether Mr. George would desire to continue the Coalition, which was originally an emergency war-time measure, or would at last abandon the Tories and appeal for the support of a united Liberal party. Now the heralds who have announced a February election have hastened to add that Mr. George has obtained the consent of Lord Birkenhead, (an increasingly powerful force among the Tories) Lord Curzon and Sir Robert Horne. If so, it is to be a Coalition Election, in the Premier's view, to be followed by another Coalition Ministry. There is not to be a fusion of the two great parties, such as many Coalition Liberals, including Mr. George himself, toyed with a year or more ago. It is too well known that the masses of Liberals in the country would have nothing to say to such a scheme, and its result, if carried into effect, would be that the new party would be the old Conservative party under another name, tinctured with a dash of moderate Liberals and slightly liberalized by Mr. George. Only slightly liberalized, for what transforming and directing power would Mr. George exert in an army to which he would have contributed so few battalions! That is the sort of unified National party which the excellent Lord Derby—typical-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly English, Tory and landlord—ardently desires. There was a young lady of Riga—and the Tory tiger is to absorb Mr. George. That is how Sir George Younger, whose function it is to look after the interests of the Tory party, sees it. But it is by no means how Mr. Lloyd George sees it. Fusion, we must suppose, he would contemplate without disfavor if he could carry into it the organizations of the Liberal rank and file, because then he would contribute a roughly equal proportion of the party strength, and his personal dominance would assure him a dictatorship. But fusion with nine-tenths of the Liberals standing outside does not attract him. He may conceivably be driven even to that in time. No one knows, probably he himself does not know, what course he will take if the Free Liberals, who are unquestionably the bulk of the party in the country, remain antagonistic to him. At present his lieutenants are making overtures to the Free Liberals in the country, but without success.

If Mr. George should find that his Coalition Liberals are likely to be squeezed out of politics or that the Tories are tiring of him, he may have to choose definitely between finishing with the Tories in order to return to the one Liberal fold or throwing in his fortunes with them altogether. At present his purpose is to found a Liberal party of his own—it is believed that a "National Liberal party" will be born on January 21st—and to lead this party into the election, with Free Liberal support if he can but without it if he cannot, demanding to be returned as the leader of another Coalition government. The Tories are to fight their own battle on parallel lines and there will presumably be some rough agreement about allotment of seats. There was such an agreement in November, 1918, and most profitable it was for the Tories. Sir George Younger was the man who engineered it. This time, it is supposed, Mr. Lloyd George will see that his interests are better looked after. He will be the leader of a definite party, with a machine, and ample funds. Sir George Younger does not like it, naturally. He has gone out of his way to announce publicly that he disapproves of an early General Election and that, if the Prime Minister insists on it, he and many of his supporters will not stand as Coalitionists at all. Sir George is well aware of the danger to the Tory party involved in a positive increase of strength to Mr. George. That is the last thing that he desires: But his public and dramatic outburst against the idea of an early election must have important consequences. There is no doubt that Mr. George wants, and in his heart has decided on, a February election. The Tory "boss" now tells him that the Tories will not have it and reminds him crudely that the Tories are the most powerful party. If Mr. George gives way now, even though he has not himself announced that he intends this election, he admits the power of the Tory machine to keep him in his place. Mr. George does not really submit to or forgive such humiliation. That he has never himself said a word about an early election is immaterial; everyone knows that Sir George Younger's shafts are aimed at him. But if Mr. George does not "knuckle under" but, insists on having his election whether the Tory machine supports him or not? Then there would be a split in the Tory party, large numbers of whose members are very restless under Mr. George and he would have, if he desired it, an admirable pretext for cutting loose from the Tories and going his own Liberal way. But many people refuse to believe that he dare face an election if the Tory machine were cold towards him. He wants to secure the election of as many Coalition Liberals as possible. The Free Liberals will not help him. If, then, the Tory machine refused to make room for a good many of his candidates and to give them its support, his prospects would be severely injured. His own interests demand that he should either have the Tory organization loyally behind him or should assert his complete independence of it. If he cannot do either he had better postpone the election.

But so far this is mere electioneering. One looks for a principle. Why should there be an election at all? The government have been only three years in office and have therefore two more years to run. It can hardly be maintained that they have fulfilled their election program. They have indeed made a peace but it was not presumably the peace they meant to make, for it is now the main plank of Mr. George's European program to unmake it as fast as possible and substitute something better. They certainly have not made England a land fit for heroes as they set out to do. They have not hanged the Kaiser nor even tried him, and as for squeezing untold indemnities out of Germany they are said every week to be on the verge of breaking finally with France in their anxiety to give Germany a chance. There was a pledge too about the reform of the House of Lords. That also has still to be honored.

Nor is an election needed to secure the nation's approval for a new and striking program. They would perhaps parade their acceptance of the Geddes economy report and promise retrenchment in various directions. They would declare for the reconstruction of European commerce and a fairer treatment of Russia, Germany and Austria. Almost they would adopt the old Liberal motto of "Peace, Retrenchment and Reform." But the truth

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is that they are perfectly free and empowered at this moment to go ahead with such policies as these and the country asks nothing better than to be presented not with promises, of which it has had enough and to spare, but with actual performance. Mr. Lloyd George is too well aware of this to be moved entirely by the idea of propounding a program for the future. Promises there will certainly be. He is understood to have in mind a broad and beneficent vision of a reconstructed Europe such as will not be unattractive if and when he translates it into glowing words upon the platform. And, after all, if he definitely promises a reduction in expenditure of a hundred or two millions, he may reasonably hope that the public will forget who it was that ran up the original bill. But the strong plank in Mr. George's election program is simply his prestige. As in November, 1918, he went to the country on his success in "winning the war" so now he would like to capitalize the immense personal credit which he has won by the Irish settlement and which is in no way diminished by the acute dissensions over the settlement in Ireland itself. (On the other hand, it would be monstrous to go to an election with the Irish settlement not duly translated to the statute-book.) Mr. George has other assets, though this transcends them all. Everything centres on him in our policy both foreign and domestic. The period of recuperation after a great war is always a time for liberal inclinations and his recent course in European affairs has been distinctly liberal. Finally, if it comes to an election, it will be counted to him for righteousness that his government has stood in consistently with the United States at the Washington Conference.

Still, here is more electioneering, admittedly, than principle. So says Sir George Younger, than whom there is no more astute electioneer, except possibly the Premier himself. Sir George Younger and Mr. Austen Chamberlain do not want an election now. They want performance rather than promise to show to the country. In particular they demand the reform of the House of Lords, which Mr. George included in his election compact with the Tories in 1918. Reform of the House of Lords is a thing which the real Conservatives care very much about. It means, no doubt, the abandonment of hereditary principle and the substitution of a comparatively democratic House, but this House will be conservative in character and its reconstitution will be accompanied, in the Conservative plan, by the abolition of the Parliament act. Now the Parliament act is the guarantee to any Liberal or Labor government—and it is the possibility of a Labor government that the Conservatives keep in view—that they can get any large piece of reform substantially unchanged through the House of Lords, for any bill sent up by the House of Commons can only be rejected twice with effect by the Lords; at its third appearance, whether accepted or rejected by them, it goes on the Statute book. Really, therefore, the Tory party through Sir George Younger are asking that the Parliament act, the hope of the Labor party, should be repealed before the present government go to a general election.

Mr. Lloyd George, one may be sure, feels no enthusiasm about reforming the House of Lords. It is easy to say "reform!"; but every man has his own ideas about the constitution of the reformed house and the degree to which it should have the power to delay or destroy the proposals of the ministry of the day. Mr. George's instincts must be strongly against the idea of a house as Conservative as the Sir George Youngers would like it to be. If he were about to fuse the two old parties once and for all in order to take the field against Labor (depicted as a would-be revolutionary force), then he might be willing to set up a reactionary House of Lords. But in any event why do it now? At present Labor is depressed, divided against itself, discredited. Why should Mr. George, who hopes to profit by this weakness, administer to Labor so strong a restorative as he would by setting up a Second Chamber which every Labor man in England would recognize to be directed against the fulfillment of the Labor program by the first Labor ministry? The essence of the situation—at this moment, let us be careful to repeat—is that Mr. Lloyd George's ultimate course is still unknown not only to the rest of us but almost certainly to himself. Only a few days ago the Free Liberals in Manchester, when the chief Coalition Liberal Whip went down to negotiate with them, were hopeful that Mr. George was about to break with the Tories and ask for a united and independent Liberal party. For all we know Mr. George may yet be found availing himself of the Parliament act to force liberal legislation through the House of Lords. It is unlikely indeed, but if Mr. George is unsure of his course why should he burden himself unnecessarily with a reactionary Second Chamber which he could not defeat? He could defeat at any time the present House of Lords.

The situation, it will be seen, is uncertain and confused. Labor is weak. Mr. George wants to found a Liberal party of his own and to secure cooperation with the Free Liberals without losing his grip on the Conservatives. The Conservatives are suspicious of his recent past and his intentions. Most of them dislike his policy of conciliation to-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wards Ireland. It is known that although the Liverpool Unionist Conference some weeks ago supported the Irish negotiations the bulk of the delegates were extremely cold and suspicious. They distrust his overtures to the Free Liberals, fearing (with cause) that he might emerge suddenly as the leader of a strong and united Liberal party. They are themselves divided; there are Die-Hards who hate the Coalition; centre-men who will not give up an inch of ground to Coalition-Liberals but will for the present support a Coalition-Ministry; some who are for an election and some who are not. When it was first announced that Mr. George meant to have an immediate election it was understood that he had on his side all the Tory Ministers except Mr. Chamberlain and that the Tory machine would support him and, wherever possible, his candidates. For his candidates will need Tory votes now as they did in 1918. But if Sir George Younger's threats convince Mr. George that the Tory machine will not give him the expected backing, he is in different case. Will he draw in his horns, accept (for the time) the slap in the face and bide a while? Will he stake all on his prestige, especially if he brings back from Cannes the prize of a great conference for European reconstruction? Perhaps you will know something of the answer by the time this article sees the light. But if the election comes now, he would be a bold man who would say what will emerge from such a medley of conflicting forces. AN ENGLISH LIBERAL.

England, January 7.

Geneva: Half a League Onward

INTERNATIONAL conferences do not just happen. They have to convene. Some one, by some authority, must convoke them. The date, the place, the membership, the agenda, must be agreed upon in advance. If no machinery exists for the purpose, this means negotiation. Not only does negotiation take time, but its results cannot be known until it is finished.

Thus, the first Hague Conference did not meet until nine months after the Tsar's call was issued; and though President Roosevelt proposed the second Hague Conference in October, 1904, its sessions did not begin until June, 1907. More recently, there has been difficulty in getting the Allies' Supreme Council together to deal with the legacies of the war, even on so pressing a question as that of Upper Silesia. The present Washington Conference, with only nine powers represented, assembled more promptly, four months after the announcement that "informal but definite inquiries" had been made. In all of these instances, negotiation has succeeded in bringing about the conference. But in 1914, Sir Edward Grey's efforts to get a conference of the powers met with tragic failure.

Now the League offers some escape from this difficulty. As a mechanism for bringing people together, it has thus far proved successful. The first Assembly decided on annual meetings, beginning on the first Monday in September. The Council must meet at least once a year; in emergencies it may be summoned on short notice by the Secretary-General, and the special meeting last November was held just nine days after the British requested that the Council meet to handle the Jugoslav-Albanian dispute. Of course any state might refuse to participate. But the tradition which is growing up, as meetings continue to be held, will doubtless make refusal more and more difficult.

Forty-eight countries sent representatives to the first Assembly at Geneva in November, 1920. After the first Assembly adjourned, it was taken for granted that the second Assembly would meet according to schedule. No convoking was needed. The preliminary work was carried on through the intervening nine months by the Secretariat with the Council's approval. And on September 5, 1921, representatives of forty-two nations again came together at Geneva. A president was elected on the first day. The six committees were set up on the second day, and the precedent of the first Assembly, that each member was to be represented on each committee, was followed without any question. These committees actually began to function on the second day. The third day was devoted to disputed questions concerning the agenda. By the fourth day the Assembly was ready for the general debate on the work of the Council. So that the Assembly was not only able to meet; its precedents enabled it to become quickly and effectively organized as a working body.

But some members of the League failed to occupy their seats at the second Assembly. The six absentees happened to be Latin American states, and hence there was much talk of Latin America's "disaffection." Argentine was said to have withdrawn from the League, but her government has never advised the League of any such intention. The absence of Guatemala, Honduras, and Salvador was doubtless attributable to their preoccupation with forming the new Central American Federation, and perhaps Nicaragua's absence was to be similarly explained. With representatives present from Bolivia, Brazil, Chili, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela, it can hardly be said that Latin America has deserted the League. Still less may the League be explained as a merely European-Asiatic combination.

League membership is still a problem, however. With Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania admitted by the second Assembly, only Ecuador, Germany, Hedjaz, Hungary, Mexico, Russia, Turkey and the United States still stand outside. The Argentine proposal, that "all sovereign states recognized by the community of nations" should be members of the League ipso facto, involved so radical a transformation that it received the support of only Chili and Persia. The suggestion that a few small states like Monaco and San Marino should be given a kind of associate membership met with scant favor. With Germany, Russia and the United States on the outside, the fifty-one members still constitute in a sense only half a League. Yet they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

show every disposition to push this half a League onward, and to make it an effective agency for safeguarding the world's peace.

Now the Covenant was not designed for half a League. Its framers envisaged a more nearly completely organized world. In some details, of course, it has proved unworkable. But on the whole it is standing the strain. Some attempts were made in the Assembly to secure radical changes. Certain smaller states vigorously opposed Canada's proposal that Article X be struck out, and the Assembly again postponed action on it. The attempts of China and Czecho-Slovakia to modify the provision on regional understandings found wide encouragement, but were finally defeated. Several minor amendments were accepted, and an important amendment elaborates the article concerning the process of amendment. After long debates on the scope and effect of Article XVI on economic blockade, an amendment was voted empowering the Council to give an opinion as to whether a violation of the Covenant has occurred and to recommend the economic measures to be taken. Though these amendments were voted unanimously in the Assembly, they are not to be binding until a protocol embodying them is ratified by all the states represented in the Council and by a majority of the members represented in the Assembly. Even then no dissenting state will be bound by them.

The personnel of the Assembly represented various walks of life, though with the exceptions of Jouhaux and Oudegeest on the disarmament commission, there were no prominent labor men among them. Most of the delegations included diplomats. Some of the delegations now have League of Nations experts. Moreover, there is a tendency for the same individuals to continue as League representatives. In this way, and as a result of the generous use of substitutes, the world is getting a corps of people who not only know their own fields thoroughly but also know the people in other countries so that they can work together harmoniously.

But the manning of the Assembly and the Council still presents difficulties. Assurance is needed that action at home will follow assent at Geneva. For this reason it seems desirable that governments should be represented in the Assembly by their acting prime ministers or foreign ministers. But domestic exigencies and immense distances will often make this very difficult. Mr. Lloyd George and M. Briand can decide only at the last minute about attending the Washington Conference. Foreign ministers ought to be less restricted. The Assembly should be a general gathering-place for foreign ministers. Bulgaria, Luxembourg and Norway sent their premiers to the second Assembly; Czecho-Slovakia, Esthonia, Greece, the Netherlands, Portugal and Switzerland their ministers of foreign affairs; many other states sent Cabinet ministers or members of parliament. But economy compels most of the distant countries to draw their representatives from among their European diplomatic representatives.

The Council has adopted the practice of submitting to each Assembly a report on its work during the previous year. The general debate on this report furnishes a good barometer of world affairs. The Council's report introduces a sort of free-for-all discussion by a committee-of-the-whole, on how the world is getting on. Any delegate may criticize the Council for what it has failed to do, as well as for what it has done. It is a convenient time for general ventilation, for registering complaints, for throwing out suggestions, for making "copy" for home consumption.

This open debate raised a large number of general political questions, on some of which the Assembly was able to register its views even though other action was not possible. It voted to send a commission of inquiry to Albania without awaiting the determination of her frontiers by the Conference of Ambassadors which had the task in hand. It expressed a hope that the final peace with Turkey would include provision for a national home for the Armenians "entirely independent of Turkish rule." It urged the Allies to settle the status of Eastern Galicia. It gave extended hearing to the Polish-Lithuanian dispute concerning Vilna, and strongly supported the Council in its effort to get the two parties to accept the proposals drawn by M. Hymans as mediator. It gave Bolivia and Chili a chance to air their dispute concerning their peace treaty of 1904, without admitting to the agenda Bolivia's demand that the treaty be revised.

Uppermost in the minds of all who spoke in the general debate was the economic plight of Europe—exchange, the staggering debts, unemployment, freedom of transit, the rehabilitation of Austria, and the feeding of Russia. For solving such problems, the Assembly found little to offer. The problems of exchange had been considered by the Brussels Financial Conference, without much result. International conventions on unemployment had been drawn by the International Labour Conferences at Washington and Genoa, and are in process of ratification. Distinct progress toward freedom of transit and improved communications had been made by the Passport Conference at Paris and by the Transit Conference at Barcelona. The success of the Ter Meulen bond scheme for the financial relief of Austria awaits the United States' agreement to join with the other countries in suspending for twenty years all claims on Austrian assets with respect to reparation payments or relief credits. In spite of the Pope's appeal and Dr. Nansen's manly eloquence, the Assembly could only express a pious hope about the famine in Russia.

A solid achievement of the second Assembly was its completion of the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The statute of the Court was promulgated by the first Assembly, and embodied in a protocol which has been ratified by thirty-two members of the League. Thirty years of effort have thus come into fruition. The League has succeeded in doing what the Hague Conferences failed to do. But it remained to be seen whether the complicated machinery for electing the judges would work. Eleven judges and four deputies were to be chosen from a list of eighty-nine nominees proposed by members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and they were to "represent the main forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world." The procedure involved independent and simultaneous action by the Assembly and by the Council. In the Secretariat it was feared that the election would take a fortnight. But it was completed in three days. In less than a week all the persons elected had accepted. From the first it was clear that an American would be chosen. Mr. John Bassett Moore, whose renown in international law is second to no other American's, will add as largely to the Court's prestige as to its capacity for service. The judges-elect are now scheduled to meet at the Hague on January 30, 1922, and the Court will then be ready for business. If its docket may not be full for some time to come, the effect of its existence on inter-governmental relations should be immediate.

Is the League proving to be a "super-state"? All of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us do not agree, perhaps, as to just what a "super-state" is. But each of us may claim the privilege of Humpty-Dumpty, and make his words mean exactly what he wants them to mean, "no more and no less." None of us needs to feel cramped by other men's dictionaries. Black ink on white paper does not live by itself alone, even when the document be called a Covenant or a Constitution. So much is abundantly proved by the electoral college provisions of the Constitution of the United States. So the provisions of the Covenant, alone, will not tell us whether the League is a "super-state." We must see how they are applied in practice, how human beings act or refuse to act according to them. We must judge, not the League abstraction, debated in 1920, but the League actuality with a record of two years' achievements. A typical case may test our use of Humpty-Dumpty's privilege, and may help us to decide about using the ugly label "super-state."

The League's efforts to suppress the white slave traffic furnish an example. It was a subject on which there was little difference of opinion. No intense national prejudice was involved. No large vested interests could be disturbed. Everyone admitted that the International Conventions of 1904 and 1910 were inadequate since the war. It would seem a simple matter for a "super-state" to deal a death blow to this nefarious trade. Yet what actually happened? The first Assembly gave the matter long consideration. It concluded that experts would have to be assembled. Representatives of thirty-four countries met in a conference six months later, and adopted a number of recommendations which were included in a final act and laid before the Council. Then the British experts prepared a draft treaty, and copies were distributed to all members of the League. Later the Council approved the recommendations and the British draft, and passed them on to the second Assembly. Again, they were carefully considered by an Assembly committee, on which all members of the League were represented. This committee proposed that the Assembly should recommend that the draft treaty be signed then and there by those delegates who possessed the necessary authority and should request other delegates to seek such authority from their governments. When signed, the treaty would still not bind any government which had not ratified. But the committee's proposal precipitated a long struggle. The French and Jugoslav delegations stood out for another special international conference. They contended that the Assembly was not a treaty-making body. They pleaded for more time. Finally, when the Assembly adopted the committee's proposal, so many states abstained from voting that the force of the recommendation was greatly weakened. If such is the course of a friendly arrangement about a matter on which all interested states are substantially agreed, what are the chances of a state's losing its own individuality through the encroachments of the League?

On its present record, on the work of the two Assemblies, of the sixteen sessions of the Council, of the three International Labour Conferences, of the Brussels Financial Conference, of the Barcelona Transit Conference, of the Geneva White Slave Conférence, of the Paris Passport Conference, and of the numerous commissions set up to deal with special questions—on this record, only a very bold person can say that the League is a complete success. Only a blind person can say that the League is dead or dying. Two years have made it abundantly clear that the League rests on consent and not on coercion. As a mechanism, its form may be far from final; it may need to be readapted by each decade to meet its own needs; but it works. As an institution, it may be weak; but it carries on.

Yet in a short two years, has not the League become a necessity? What other body exists that could take over its work, that could have settled the Aaland Islands case, that could have kept Poland and Lithuania out of war over Vilna, that could have drawn a boundary in Upper Silesia, that could have persuaded the Jugoslavs to quit Albanian territory? If the League were abolished tomorrow, its fifty-one members *might* in time be brought to agree upon some other scheme for organizing the world's peace. Mr. Balfour has said that it could not be done in this generation. Who can be sure that it *would* be done in this or even in the next generation?

MANLEY O. HUDSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

Professor Friday's Article

SIR: Professor Friday's article, The Accumulation of Capital, raises a number of questions with regard to the adequacy of the methods employed to secure an estimate of our national savings.

In the first place, the items summarized as "Capital exported, $1,800,000,000," do not seem to represent actual savings during the year, but merely the excess of goods sold over goods imported. In so far as this excess of exports was obtained by depleting the inventories carried by our manufacturers and traders, the item does not represent an actual saving but merely a change in the form of our wealth. Considering the pressure which has been brought to bear upon business firms during the present year to reduce their inventories in order to reduce borrowings, considering also the disappearance of the motives which led to the piling up of unusually large inventories last year, it seems impossible that the "favorable" balance of trade bears any significant relation to the excess of production over consumption during the year.

A similar consideration applies to the item, "Building Operations other than corporate." The figure of a billion dollars obviously does not represent saving by the individuals who have built the homes, as such construction is financed chiefly out of borrowings and out of past savings. Neither does it measure a saving from the standpoint of the country as a whole, unless the lumber and other materials used up in the building operations have been replaced by new production. Moreover, there should be a deduction for buildings demolished during the year, and also for depreciation on existing buildings, in so far as it has not been offset by betterments. Finally, this item apparently duplicates in large part the item "Income saved by Agriculture and Businesses not Corporate."

The item last referred to also duplicates the first item, "Domestic Securities Purchased," as the saving of farmers and other owners of unincorporated businesses has taken the form largely of the repayment of debts, and the funds so repaid have been available for the purchase of new securities.

The item "Domestic Securities Purchased," which constitutes more than one-half the total estimated saving, is merely the figure for securities *sold,* and bears no obvious relation to the amount actually saved. Professor Friday has deducted from the total of securities sold those which are issued for refunding purposes, but he has failed to allow for the cases where securities have been issued to pay off bank loans. Yet the latter is the predominant type of security issued in 1921, and the funds realized by such sales are the identical funds which are invested in the new securities. Typically what has been taking place is something like this: Some corporations liquidate their inventories and deposit the funds in banks, or pay off bank loans. The shrinkage in general business makes it difficult for the banks to make new loans at prevailing rates, and interest rates work downward. Other corporations, which have not succeeded in liquidating their inventories issue bands to secure funds to repay their bank loans. The bonds are sold to investors and speculators who pay for them, not out of their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

savings, but by borrowing the funds which have been paid to or deposited with the banks by the first group of corporations. The repayment of loans with the proceeds of these bond issues again strengthens the lending power of the banks, the money market weakens, new bond issues are encouraged, and so the liquidating stage of the cycle proceeds.

The tremendous demand for bonds in the past few weeks does not indicate a tremendous increase in savings. It indicates that buyers are eager to take advantage of an unusual opportunity by borrowing money at, say, six percent and investing it in bonds yielding from seven to eight percent. When the disparity in the rates for short time and long time loans disappears, as it must unless business revives before the series of new issues to refund bank loans is completed, the demand for bonds will be less insistent, although saving will go on then as it does now.

Finally, the item "State, Municipal and United States Government Securities" indicates merely that funds have been transferred to the government, but means nothing with respect to national saving unless controlled by figures showing the purposes for which the funds have been expended. In so far as these funds have gone back into consumptive channels through payment of interest, pensions, compensation for disabled veterans, and payment for military and naval service generally, they indicate merely a shifting of purchasing power from one hand to another.

Any one of these errors might be overlooked, but the cumulative effect of so many lapses of method seems to be to make the entire calculation nearly valueless.

Chicago, Illinois. C. O. HARDY.

A Reply to Mr. Hardy

SIR: If the facts concerning the reduction of inventories and the purchase of securities out of bank loans which Mr. Hardy hypothecates above actually existed; and if no allowance had been made for them in my article on capital accumulation, they would indeed "make the entire calculation nearly valueless." Every theoretical consideration which he mentions was in the mind of the writer in making his estimate. In so far as they were valid he has made liberal allowances for them.

Unfortunately the limits of a New Republic article do not allow one to set forth all the detailed figures which enter into a conclusion with respect to the volume of funds available upon the capital market within a year.

New York City. DAVID FRIDAY.

The Mona Lisa Smile

SIR: When civilization started on its long journey and men raised their broods in caves, woman found that she must not laugh at the man thing that blocked the doorway or he turned sullen and refused to hunt the necessary meat for the children. Through succeeding generations this hard learned lesson has never been lost. But once a man named Leonardo caught, not the smile, but the ripple caused by its repression and fixed it on canvas for those who understand to read.

Surely this same ripple of repressed amusement must flicker over the faces of womankind the country over when a celibate Archbishop and other learned dignitaries bend the weight of their cerebral theorizing to the problem of birth control. "Children troop from heaven because God wills it," says Archbishop Hayes. True. But woman is the gateway through which they must enter: a gateway guarded by a flaming sword of pain and terror, a sword that earns for women and women only the right to say how many "souls from God" shall enter this world. Women both in and out of Mother Church, intuitively recognize this fact, for few indeed are those who live up to the possibilities of their fecundity, not because God wills it, but because women will it.

Inherent in every woman is the desire for children, but beyond and above that merely instinctive desire is the determination that certain conditions must be fulfilled or she will not bring children into the world. And it follows as the day the night that with the education of women and their broader outlook on life they will choose more and more intelligently the conditions under which they are willing to replenish the earth. That men should feel that on their shoulders rests the responsibility of stopping open discussion of birth control and that by so doing they are changing women's attitude in the matter is—but isn't it hopeless, Leonardo? Men's sense of humor seems still somewhat abortive, so most of us listen to the thunders of the good Archbishop with downcast eyes and silent lips which he, no doubt, interprets as conviction of sin, but just between you and me, Leonardo, it is to smile, is it not? ESTELLE TUFTS MORAN.

The League and the Peace Treaties

SIR: After your excellent editorial of October 5th, urging that "popular interest in the [Washington] Conference should prepare the way for an attitude of reasonable cooperation with the League," the following statement in your issue of December 7th has amazed me:

> "The new association of nations proposed by Messrs. Harding and Hughes will possess a decisive advantage over the League of Nations. The League of Nations is still bound hand and foot by the instrument, the Treaty of Versailles, which created it. It cannot substitute conference for war as an agency of international legislation because the Treaty of Versailles derives its sanction not from consent but from force. The chief business of any future association of nations will not be to execute the Treaty of Versailles, but to discover and work out the most available and least costly means of revising it."

I assume that by "the Treaty of Versailles" you mean all of the treaties framed by the Paris Peace Conference, and not merely the peace treaty with Germany of June 28, 1919. Even with this broader construction of your reference, however, I think you have wholly mistaken the relation between the League of Nations and the treaties of peace.

The Covenant of the League does form Part I of the treaties of peace with Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Ratification of some or all of the peace treaties by twenty-nine of the signatories has made these states members of the League of Nations. But twenty-two other states have joined the League of Nations quite independently of other parts of the treaties of peace, and I am at a loss to understand why you consider the present League of fifty-one states "bound hand and foot by the Treaty of Versailles."

One may criticize the Paris Peace Conference for having embodied the Covenant in the peace treaties at all. In my judgment it is exceedingly doubtful whether any League could have been established by the Paris Peace Conference if President Wilson had not insisted that its covenant should form a part of the peace treaties. But this decision was not taken until some time in March, 1919, after many of the commissions working on the treaty with Germany had considerably advanced their work. In the earlier stages of the Peace Conference there was little willingness among the framers of the treaty to impose responsibilities on the League of Nations; but as the work of the Conference progressed the disposition increased to rely upon the League for future adjustments. Yet there are surprisingly few references to the League in the treaties of peace. I venture to think that nearly all of the parts of the peace treaties to which the New Republic objects contain no references to the League. The League has nothing to do with reparations, for instance, nor with the economic obligations imposed on the "ex-enemy" states. In fact, in the two years that it has now been in operation, very little of its activity has had anything to do with the peace treaties. It is true that the Council of the League took a decision with reference to Eupen and Malmedy. It is true that the Council assumed the guarantee of the provisions for protecting racial, linguistic and religious minorities contained in the Austrian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian treaties. It has appointed a high commissioner of the League for the Free City of Danzig, and a Commission representing the League of Nations is governing the Sarre Basin. But outside of these fields the work of the League has had little to do with the treaties of peace, and in League circles there has been a determined effort to keep the League from being or even seeming to be an instrument for their execution. The Supreme Allied Council and the Conference of Ambassadors at Paris are the bodies which "execute" the peace treaties, as you pointed out on October 5th. In fact, much of your past criticism of the League is based on the relative power of these bodies. In your issue of September 29, 1920, you found the League a "sideshow" on this account,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because as you said "the 'heart' of the Treaty [of Versailles]—the Reparations and Reprisal, is specifically excluded from the jurisdiction of the League."

I do not mean to say that the treaties of peace are not important political facts which largely shape the political structure of the world into which the League has been born and in which it moves. But how could any association of nations be free of these important facts? Has not M. Briand's speech at Washington recently shown us that the Washington Conference works under the same limitations as the League? I cannot imagine an association of nations which would not include Great Britain, France, and Italy, and certainly those powers are so connected with the treaties of peace that no association to which they belong can ignore the work of the Paris Peace Conference. It is in this sense, and in this sense only, that the League of Nations has been bound by the treaties of peace. And I think it is in this sense that any association of nations would be similarly bound. A new association, like the existing League, would have to function alongside the Supreme Council and the Conference of Ambassadors, as the world stands today.

Your insistence on the revision of the peace treaties raises altogether different problems. The League offers an agency to which Article XIX of the Covenant has given a special competence for suggesting the revision of those treaties. I see no reason for thinking that revision could be accomplished more easily in an "association" than in the League. The cooperation of the United States in either would make revision much less difficult. The sloughing off of parts of the treaties of peace is already under way—the trials for war crimes have been all but forgotten; many of the seized ships have been sold back to the Germans; reparations undergo a new arrangement almost every month. If the time should come when political thought in Europe would justify an avowed revision, the conference might be held under the auspices of the League quite as easily as under the auspices of some other association. The same governments must participate in either case.

Cambridge, Massachusetts. MANLEY O. HUDSON.

Social Justice and the Roman Catholic Church

SIR: Let us pick out, for Mr. Charles L. Buchanan's information, the properly so called "political and sociological aspects" of America's hierarchical "Romanism," and examine them. We agree with him that "in so far as these aspects threaten to interfere with and obstruct the fundamental principles of this republic and human progress, they must be subject to open inspection and discussion."

Four Roman Catholic Bishops publicly issued a Social Reconstruction Program more than two years ago. They urged the gradual break down of the present capitalistic system and its substitution by a true co-operative commonwealth, through which the workers would come into the ownership of the instruments of production. The episcopal recommendations in effect involve the practical abolition of the existing wage slavery. One of the four Bishops, signing this Program, was Archbishop Hayes of New York. Afterward, the Program was substantially incorporated in the Pastoral letter of the entire American Hierarchy.

Ever since, Father John A. Ryan, director of the Social Action department of the National Catholic Welfare Council, has been measuring the economic reactions of the present period by the tape of this Program and Pastoral. Consequently, the Social Action department has come out squarely against the "open shop" movement and the general practice of wage reductions. In three vigorous public statements, at least, Father Ryan has criticized the reactionary tactics of anti-social employing capitalists, and encouraged the workers to insist upon their fundamentally Christian right to organize and bargain collectively. A few weeks ago, Cardinal O'Connell himself, also publicly castigated attempts to choke the voice of labor by injunction.

In fact, no Christian Church in the United States has gone as far as the Roman Catholic Church in her authoritative and public utterances upon the injustice of modern commercialism, which Father Husslein, the Jesuit sociologist of Fordham university, characterizes as antagonistic to the entire spirit of Christianity.

Mr. Buchanan's ignorance can be due only to one fact—ironically enough, he refrains from reading the radical, liberal and labor publications. For the capitalistic organs, including the press associations, in the large have killed and continue to kill the news story of the Catholic Church's efforts to aid in effecting social justice, that is in realizing "the fundamental principles of the republic" and bringing about true "human progress."

Surely, it is a strange and extraordinary "surreptitious censorship," which in the suspicion of Mr. Buchanan "the Roman Catholic Church organization" imposes upon "our American press." Incidentally, our own conviction is that Mr. Buchanan's "American press" from a social justice point of view is neither "ours" nor "American."

New York City. JOHN HEARLEY.

Raymond Poincaré

SIR: Raymond Poincaré, premier and minister of foreign affairs, may or may not be the same Poincaré, who led the "Bloc National" and who in the Revue des Deux Mondes told France what spoils she was entitled to by her victory in a war of defence. Political prophecy, especially as regards French politics, is an interesting, but hazardous game. The Paris correspondent of the New York Times reminds us how often in the past French politicians have sobered down when once they have reached the goal. Briand's "rouge" became "rose pale" once he became separated from ordinary citizens by numerous antichambers and huissiers. Therefore we are led to hope and believe that perhaps the new French premier will, by a certain natural law of French politics, converge towards the Centre—and reach a working agreement with the groups of the Left. But at best it would be but a compromise—and France has had about as many compromises as are good for her. What she needs is a violent remedy—a good, strong innoculation, and it is submitted that the very best virus for her system is the virus of "nationalisme à outrance." Let her under the guidance of her Lorraine fire eater fling defiance to Europe and America, with her great armies of "poilus" and her fleets of submarines, let her wreck the Entente Cordiale and set at nought the work of the Washington Conference.

Let her. And then one day, her citizens will awaken and discover that the world is estranged from them—hidden behind a wall of bayonets—French bayonets. Thus by a process similar to that discovered by Pasteur, France will recover. And her people, sick to death of her leaders, drugged by the dreams of imperialism, will turn to others, worthier of her trust. And a wiser, saner France will cooperate with Great Britain and the United States, to make this world a better place to live in. Let Poincaré do his damnedest!

New York City. FRANCIS COLT DE WOLF.

Mr. Beck's Communication

SIR: Pointing out new inaccuracies in Mr. Beck's communication, after the letters of Mr. Frankfurter and Mr. Arnold, is like carrying coals to Newcastle. However, the Solicitor-General, in his excursion into Russian history, makes some statements which really require comment. He darkly insinuates that "Some one in the Wilson administration intervened to secure the release of Trotsky when the English government had the arch-anarchist in irons at Halifax." Leaving to the anarchists of the world the task of correcting Mr. Beck's poetic but inaccurate characterization of Trotsky as "the arch-anarchist," it may be observed that the dominant factor in securing Trotsky's release was a note sent to the British government by Foreign Minister Milyukov, acting under pressure from the newly formed soviets.

W. H. C.

Not "To Really Spoil the Game"

SIR: I send you the following editorial lead (gratis); this is genuinely advance stuff.

The foot ball conference will soon meet in New York to establish the 1922 rules, and the arms conference in Washington carries on. It is believed forward passing and the use of poison gasses will come up for discussion, and perhaps for some modification, but in neither case will anything be done to really spoil the game.

EZRA BOWEN.

Easton, Pennsylvania.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Boddy Case

SIR: There are several phases of the Boddy case that should make New Yorkers look to themselves a bit,—that is, to the municipal government that they must stand sponsor for. I hold no brief for the accused man,—nor, in part of what I shall write, am I concerned with his color. Rather do I want to speak for all poverty-burdened, alien, defenceless folk whom we persecute, torture and sometimes kill by our "legal" machinery. I want to hold up to my fellow Americans the mirror wherein they can see a certain type of their unjust, unAmerican and unChristian selves. I want to show them the other side of the Boddy case which is like unto many other criminal cases, be the accused white or black.

Boddy said: "In New York City what they mean by taking you to the station house, means to kick you round for two or three hours; and I had that done to me several times." The point is many absolutely innocent men and women, black and white, can say that same thing! It is the vicious "Third Degree" that this man had experienced and that had had such an effect on him that he "saw red" and added another to the crimes for which society blames *him,* to the exclusion of itself. He knew that many a man had been killed by the "Third Degree," and he simply struck first. He was a coward. Yes, but what about the police officials who use the virtue of their place and power to torture and maim certain of the hapless persons who fall into their hands? He is a murderer. Yes, but how about the officials who, in cold blood, have carried their torture beyond the physical endurance of their helpless victims? Not only New York City but the country must face this question of the abuse of citizens under arrest and this matter of murder under the sanction of law! Are not we who fail to condemn this persecution, not to speak of those who applaud it, are we not cowards, too?

Boddy said, also: "Why should I always be beat up for nothing?" It is not alone as a Negro that he must so speak. The alien, the friendless, the feeble-minded,—he who is merely "different," has to ask, all too often, this same pitiful question. And society has no answer to it. Does this not show that the "Boddies" are not wholly to blame and that there is another side to every tragedy such as the one we are considering?

"Boddy's extradition," says one of the reports, "his trial, conviction and execution will be accomplished in record-breaking time." Yes,—and why? Because he has no money and no influential friends and because he has a black skin! A European once said to me: "Justice(?) in your country can be bought like a pound of cheese." That is not the worst of it. "Justice" is, in truth, regularly sold to the rich and it is as regularly denied to the poor, the oppressed and the alien. Who is there to disprove this? The best one can say is that there are exceptions to this oft-made charge—but they are not so many that one feels much like bragging about them. But to take the particular case of the Negro. Has not the time come when every lover of justice must ask himself, "can it be that the region in which the colored man, generally speaking, is bound to be denied justice, can it be that that region is widening?" If the Negro was the only one to suffer from such a state of affairs, there might be some inhuman enough to acquiesce in it; but injustice, like hate, is a two-edged weapon: it halts the progress of the people or the country where it obtains as much as it does the individual or the racial group against which it is directed. The Boddy case furnishes not so much an opportunity to damn the Negro (and thereby lower ourselves) as it does an opportunity to consider seriously our own shortcomings; that is to say, those of our hired men whom we appoint or elect, and for whose unlawful and unAmerican acts we are, before God, responsible. It gives us the chance not merely to convict a murderer, but to demand of ourselves what part society has had in the evolution of that murderer; and, in the case of this young Negro,—what share the "law" may have had in the particular crime for which he must stand trial. It puts up to the white American the question whether the black American has not more against him, than he has against the black man.

Shall we not all of us who profess to be decent and fair-minded citizens recognize this matter of criminality in official positions,—particularly the criminality of the "Third Degree"? Shall we not arraign ourselves, together with the Boddies that such criminality helps to make?

New York City. BLANCHE WATSON.

The French Indemnity

SIR: Was it really so utterly unreasonable of the French to think that the first few instalments of the indemnity could be paid according to the agreement, as one would gather from your columns? The whole indemnity is a very different question; probably no one expects that to be paid in full,—but the first four or five years' instalments?

Fifty years ago Germany dictated terms of peace to France, one term being military occupation of northern France till the indemnity should be paid. In a little over two years France paid the whole five milliards,—France with less than half the population, and incomparably less resources than Germany has. All this during a time of internal confusion and troubles greater than those Germany is passing through, and when the franc was worth more than the gold mark is now. In view of this achievement, it will hardly impress the unbiassed observer that the immediate demands on Germany are extortionate, or the expectation that they will be met irrational.

Professor Thorstein Veblen has suggested a very edifying means of paying the indemnity, or part of it,—the confiscation, and public sale in lots to suit, of all the landed estates in the former empire. This would at least place the cost of peace where it belongs, on the class that made the war.

It is difficult in reading the liberal journals these days, to refrain from the suspicion that their sympathy with the aggressor in the late war has impaired their vision of possibilities, as well as of justice and equity; and has also impaired their judgment of individuals.

Ashland, Massachusetts. W. C. ROSE.

[That France should have received the amount of money represented by the first few instalments and a great many more —would be a perfectly reasonable assumption, if it were possible to make a different question of the whole indemnity, as our correspondent suggests. It is universally agreed that Germany cannot pay in gold and therefore her power to pay abroad depends on her volume of exports, and on the loans she can raise abroad. Her exports are not now sufficient to pay anything like the current indemnity charges, and her capacity to raise loans abroad has been entirely destroyed by "the whole indemnity." It is unreasonable—in a practical sense—to expect payment in the circumstances. As for Professor Veblen's suggestion, it dodges the difficulty of finding buyers of the German lands who are in a position to pay for them in gold, or foreign exchange. If moneyed men from France, England and America were willing to buy at gold prices lands situated in Germany, the scheme would work. They are not willing to do that, probably for very good reasons.—THE EDITORS.]

China's Disillusionment

SIR: To your editorial in the last issue of the New Republic regarding the painful road for China to travel after the great disillusionment of the so-called international justice, I, a Chinese student in this country, ask to add only a few words.

The Chinese people now, are perfectly conscious of these facts:—

(1) That foreign exploitations have so far been successful in China, is not so much because of the malignity of the foreign governments and capitalists concerned, but mainly because of the unfortunate Chinese national trait of love of peace.

(2) That round the globe hundreds of millions who outnumber several times their exploiters and conquerors, have their grievances far more intensive than those of the Chinese and are now awakening and brewing and threatening.

It is true, therefore, that the road before the Chinese is really dangerous and painful, but the danger and the pain are by no means to be confined to any one people but to mankind as a whole. Non-cooperative? Yes, but cooperative we must be with all the rest.

The Chinese people, however, still hesitate. Why? For civilization and order are as dear (perhaps dearer) to the Chinese as to any of the self-dubbed civilized peoples. Now that the saving of these dear things has proved incompatible with that of their own being, hesitation serves only to intensify the degree and magnify the extent of their determination. Yet in whom lies the responsibility!

Chicago, Illinois. FAN YI KUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Love for Three Oranges

ON December 30th Serge Prokofieff's opera, The Love for Three Oranges, was produced at the Auditorium Theater in Chicago. It is unquestionably the most interesting stage production of the year 1921, not excepting Liliom as put on by the Theater Guild, and the Chicago Opera Association is to be congratulated accordingly. Performances like this one, and John Alden Carpenter's The Birthday of the Infanta, must convince contributors to the enormous annual deficit of the Chicago Opera Company that their generosity is worth while, for they make a magnificent addition to the art of musical drama in America.

For three years Mr. Prokofieff's opera has been heralded, after the quaint manner of the Opera Company's press agent, as a production upon which sixty, eighty, and finally a hundred thousand dollars had been spent, but beyond this financial ecstasy, the public was allowed so little advance knowledge of what it was all about that one is tempted to believe that even the astute Miss Mary Garden herself was unaware of what she had stowed away in the warehouse. Certainly, the audience assembled for the opening had no anticipation of the nature of the novelty in store for them, and the critics, defensively attentive, were in much the same box. An important world première was never less heralded.

The production is unique, although it is of the same general type as Rimsky Korsakof's Coq D'Or, Stravinski's Petroushka, and Debussy's Pelleas et Melisande. The outstanding point of difference is that Mr. Prokofieff has achieved perfect unity. His opera is a closely knit thing; one cannot extract from the whole the score, the scenery, or the action, and subject any one of them to isolated criticism; the three are interdependent and indissoluble. For once in a way Truth walks unashamed upon the boards where for generations passion has halted for arias, and death has been obligingly arrested for sextettes. At last Grand Opera, so called, has become a dramatic production.

The story is a fairy tale, slight, entirely fantastic, and burlesque, at that. There is a Prince, dying in a melancholia, who may be cured only by laughter. He is a comic Prince, treated with delightful irony. The first act concerns itself with amusing efforts to make him laugh. It is really funny. You never would have dreamed that those conventional bassos and contraltos had so much comedy in them. Mr. Ziegfeld will look at them with envy. At length the Prince laughs—of course he does,—so do godlike bank presidents and stodgy business men out in the house pinching themselves the while to see if it can be true,—but he is no sooner cured of his fatal sadness than he is cursed by a malignant witch with love for the Three Oranges, which, succeeding acts reveal, contains, each one, a traditionally beautiful blonde Princess. The tale unfolds with delightful unreality, through scenes of enchantment and wizardry, all done in comical burlesque, to the finale, when a rat sitting demurely upon the King's throne, turns into the Prince's love, and the wicked plotters, with their obliging witch, vanish, defeated, into a vague and fiery oblivion. It is Grimm and Andersen and Pushkin done over for grownups; it is childhood revisited, with an adult point of view.

Mr. Prokofieff's score is a masterpiece of modern descriptive music, and is ultra-modern in orchestral treatment. It conducts the action through four acts and ten scenes of extraordinary color, with skill and humor. It is never thin, and never vacantly boisterous; it is impressionistic, vivid, and episodic, with melodies obscurely interwoven one with another, covered in the orchestral mass, and it is brilliantly funny. It is true that there is nothing in the entire score which one may whistle as one goes out; there is no contest between a flute and a soprano; there is no melting tenor solo in the spotlight, and the troglodyte who believes he may advance only by looking backward, shakes his head over Mr. Prokofieff because his work is reminiscent of nothing. There are, however, at least two tunes which the most Victorian critic may safely enjoy. In the court scene Mr. Prokofieff has introduced a march which even Mr. Sousa might envy,—a smashing, crashing, quick step which will, I predict, be much used as an isolated thing,—like the march from Aida; and there is the Prince's song when the cure is wrought and he bursts into laughter. It is impossible to imagine anything gayer than this. The Prince laughs, a high startled reluctant sound. It comes quicker and wilder, and gradually the relieved court joins in, until the song becomes an abandonment of joyous guffaws. The singers hold their sides, the gorgeous court rocks with mirth, and so does the sympathetic house. It is only an ingrate who would demand sweet melodies; with Mr. Prokofieff's crackling, shimmering miracle in the air, melody seems no more indispensable than a pretty, stupid woman of the eighteen-eighties.

Cartoons have already been published of Boris Anisfeld's scenery, but no black and white reproduction can adequately portray the blaze of color as revealed on the stage. Rose and scarlet, orange and purple, sapphire and gold, backdrops of wild sunset skies, foregrounds of burlesque court furnishings, deserts, mountains, and witches' caverns, all are beautiful beyond reality, and all share the happy over-emphasis of the whole production. Mr. Anisfeld's imagination runs gladly along with Mr. Prokofieff's; his exaggerated settings and his gorgeously capricious costumes are the pattern to the warp of the piece. No stage sets have ever been more beautiful or more daring than these. He has builded his art not upon the sand of the specious producer, but upon the solid rock of Diaghileff, Gordon Craig, and Reinhart, and to a courageous color sense, and an extraordinary feeling for mass on the stage, he has brought extravagant humor.

If it be true, as one gathers from reading the critics, that every ointment must have its fly, I will confess that there is, in my opinion, one way in which Mr. Prokofieff's effect is not completely successful. He uses choruses of Lyricists, Tragedians, Comedians, and Empty Heads, which intervene upon the action, and every now and then, arbitrarily clear the stage. Undoubtedly the aim is to heighten the unreality by thus emphasizing the "staginess" of the performance, and to poke good natured fun at the sentimentalists,—God bless 'em,—but the result is a somewhat muddled interference. It is an idea which Mr. Bernard Shaw might have used successfully; he, and, I think, he alone, could give it the ironic quality necessary to its success.

This, however, is carping criticism. The Love for Three Oranges is a spirited and brilliant piece of work, beautifully given, and New York should demand several performances in the repertoire of the Chicago Opera Association at the Manhattan Opera House this winter. It is the last word in modern stage production, and it is to be hoped that New York critics will not be afraid of its novelty and daring quality.

JANET A. FAIRBANK.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beauty and the Beast

He Who Gets Slapped: a play in four acts, by Leonid Andreyev. Translated from the Russian by Gregory Zilboorg. The Garrick Theatre, January 9, 1922.

AT the Garrick now the Theatre Guild is presenting one of the most charming plays of the season. Under the picturesque title of He Who Gets Slapped there unfolds for us a story of a wise man who having found his wife and his trusted friend false to him and that the world did not understand him, comes at last and joins Papa Briquet's circus. There he finds the beautiful maiden, Consuelo, who loves the handsome bareback rider, Bezano. But her supposed father, Count Mancini, the decayed aristocrat, a droll figure with his odd clothes and his pompous airs, wishes Consuelo to wed the baron, a fat, horrid man but blessed with much gold. The lion-tamer, Zinida, loves Bezano also, and has strange ideas about her red lion's loving her. He—which is the name the newcomer assumes when he buries his life and its secrets in the ranks of the circus—has the droll wish to be slapped; and it turns out that the audience thinks this very funny indeed. He falls in love with Consuelo, who is a simple girl quite unable to understand the great love of the poor clown or his wise, quaint sayings. Finally the baron, since he cannot have Consuelo any other way, proposes marriage to her father, the count, who accepts with alacrity. On her farewell day in the ring the baron has Consuelo's whole path carpeted with red roses. All the circus people are invited to drink champagne during one of the intermissions, the bride's health and happiness, at the rich baron's expense. But Consuelo, though too innocent to know what fate really confronts her with the loathsome baron, is hysterical when he merely touches her. He, the clown, seeing all this, gives her a drink of poison and takes the same for himself. And so he saves her from the horror of this beast that was to possess her, and he dies with her, happy that he can meet her in worlds to come and lay his love forever at her little feet.

For such a story as this the acting at the Garrick is excellent, exactly keyed; though Mr. Calvert's rôle and his art happen to be such as might fit into quite another play also. And Mr. Simonson's setting for all this is charming, the picturesque properties of the scene especially; though the use of different levels and the fine line of arches at the back might imply a graver and bigger idea than its play shows. Miss Gillmore is not an actress yet, for her technique is still in the school-girl stage, but she has an appealing quality and a genuine feeling for the tragic little life that she portrays. He—Mr. Bennett—is perhaps a little mild, but loveable and quaint and pathetic. Miss Westley as Zinida smokes her cigarettes and swaggers about quite as a true lion-tamer in such a romance would do. And Mr. Frank Reicher, in spite of his forcing all the time and registering too much and too often in a tiresome movie manner, is every inch the Italian count of the stage, with his walk, his ridiculous voice, his lofty ways. Mr. Rutherford's Bezano smacks his lips down too much over his words when he talks; but he is a fine, strong young fellow, a hundred percent man, just such a lover as Consuelo would choose. Except for a phrase now and then that threatens to complicate the true meaning of the story and except for a little foreign something which even the simplest person in the audience scents as being mysterious and Russian, the play sails smoothly; and if one tends to sag at any time into depths of perplexity, a single look at Mr. Reicher mincing and jerking about so drolly or at Mr. Bennett's soft mass, will serve to reassure one of the loveable and engaging atmosphere of the piece. It is all as quaint and sad and adorable as an old fairy story; the hints and mysteries and provocative sayings that are left here and there only add a certain originality and modernity. This play is delightful and well worth doing for itself, I think, and one of the best things in town. It is wistful and appealing all through, and, what's more, it is always consistent.

But there can be no harm surely in speaking also of the play that Andreyev wrote and that is known in Russia; or in saying that the Guild production is wrong, though consistently wrong, throughout, and that it departs from the real play to an extent which, if it only went in the reverse direction, would make it an important original creation.

He Who Gets Slapped is the story of a man, a philosopher, who leaves the world which has never understood him and which has cheapened all his finest thoughts—a motive that has a simpler parallel in his wife's desertion of him for his inferior imitation—and comes to join a circus. Here under the clown's ridiculous garb he will say his great thoughts, tell the crowd what wise and beautiful ideas arise in him, and get himself slapped and laughed at for a fool; when all the while the mockery and the jest are at their expense. In the company there is Consuelo, not a mere young girl, but the figure of all beauty, white and rose and gold, ignorant of the world, untouched. And there too is Bezano, beautiful, cruel, destroying, as life and passion are destroying. He, the clown, loves Consuelo for herself and because she is the image of all beauty. And in the end he kills her to save her from the defilement of the baron's hands; and he dies with her, following beauty out of the world as he had followed it all his life, and slapped and jeered and misunderstood to the very last by the crowd about him.

This is Andreyev's play, a tragic fantasy around the ironical career that truth and distinction meet at the hands of the common mass of men. He Who Gets Slapped is not a great play. The beginning is superb, especially the passages where the mysterious stranger states his reasons for joining the circus and his philosophy of life—difficult and suggestive passages which seemed to be shortened in the Guild production—but the end of the play spreads out into a looser hold and—though this indefinable and insoluble mood may very well enhance a certain effect—lacks the sense of fine artistic control. So that it remains a remarkable second-rate play, but one of the most remarkable in the modern theatre. He Who Gets Slapped is a bitter, lovely thing, full of an intellectual passion in which all beauty is exalted and the drabness and commonness of men is perpetually mocked. Its poetry is glowing and bitter and cruel at bottom; its pathos under the picturesque poignancy is profound and elusive and sinister; and the gaiety and bustle of its action is an irony on the foolish stir of our living above its hidden depth and beauty, the life of the soul in the midst of the circus.

All this quality underlies the character of He himself. But would anyone mistake Mr. Bennett for anything beyond a dear, droll, plump, romantic booby, never very keen, never very complex, never bitter and mordant, though very generous and arch and loveable and pathetic? And in the Zinida at the Garrick where is the smouldering tragic darkness of the magnificent animal, the command, the tiger burning bright? Mr. Calvert's art is consummate; Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Travers as Jackson, the clown, is good in the first scene. But the worst acting of all, if we take the play from Andreyev and not from the surrounding version, is that of Mr. Frank Reicher. For the part of Mancini, Andreyev in his directions is explicit enough: the count is ragged in places, macabre, absurd, fallen so low that the only place for his lording it is among these circus people. Mancini is used as an ironical underscoring of the central character; for exactly as the case of He, the thinker, presents a mockery of the mind and imagination and truth, so Mancini, the nobleman, carries about him a travesty of fallen aristocracy and of what happens to these high aristocratic qualities of pride and form and style in the individual himself and in the crowd's opinion of them when they are no longer sustained by money. Mancini is a fantastic satire in black and white against the color of his surroundings. But Mr. Reicher only minces and struts around like the French count in old-fashioned melodrama; and misses entirely the deeper, grave and bizarre and tragic absurdity that life has come to in this man.

In a sense the Guild production is more of a unit than Andreyev's play. Andreyev took something of an old-style clown story and roughened and weighted the texture with his extravagant comment and fecundity; and this Guild production smooths it back again to the simpler story. Nearly everything in the play fits together now; though it must be said that the resulting harmony is like reducing the wind and the elements of the world to a melody played on a music-box.

In this pleasing fashion the performance was one that I enjoyed; and I am thankful to the Guild for undertaking even one of the many plays that lie in this curiously difficult and modern drama. And then, having enjoyed it, I may remark on so perfect an example of how art—as well as life—tends on its weaker side to evade the sting of reality and truth.

STARK YOUNG.

COUNTRY SONGS

Old Soldier

We wander now who marched before,
Hawking our bran from door to door,
While other men from the mill take their flour,
So it is to be an Old Soldier.

Old and sore, one's like to the hound
Turning up the stiff frozen ground,
Nosing the mould, with the night around:
So it is to be an Old Soldier.

And we who once rang out like a bell,
Have nothing now to show or to sell;
Old bones to carry, old stories to tell:
So it is to be an Old Soldier.

Lament

I walk by the shore of a lake
Where stones drag wet through a wood,
And I hear the cry of a bird—
Lone, lone.

It cries to the lake, and it cries
To the stones, and it cries to the wood,
And it cries to my own slow blood—
Lone, lone.

And once I walked by this lake,
And I heard a like cry from a bird,
Nor knew what its grief forebode—
Gone, gone.

Now the child who gathered the nuts,
And brought them to me through the wood—
The child who gathered the nuts,
That day, from our life is gone.

The Poet

"The blackbird's nest, in the briar,
The sea-gulls' nests on the ground
They are nests, and they're more than nests," he said,
"They are tokens I have found.

"Here, in the rain-dashed briar
That's a mark in the empty glade,
The blackbird's nest is left," he said,
"Clay-rimmed, uncunningly made,

"By the inland lake, its shore,
Where the surgeless water shoves,
The sea-gulls have their nests," he said,
"As low as the cattles' hooves."

I heard a poet say it,
The sojourner of a night;
His head was to the rafter,
Where he stood in a candle's light.

"Like the sea-gulls' nests your houses—
Scattered they are and low;
Like the blackbird's nest in the briar—
Uncunningly made—even so.

"But close to the ground are they reared,
The wings that take widest way,
And the birds that sing best in the wood," he said,
"Are bred with their breasts to the clay.

"You've wildness—I've turned it to song;
You've strength—I've turned it to wings;
The welkin's for your conquest then;
The wood with your music rings."

I heard a poet say it,
The sojourner of a night;
His head was to the rafter,
Where he stood in a candle's light.

PADRAIC COLUM.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is Minding Behaving?

The Analysis of Mind by Bertrand Russell F. R. S. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. $4.50.

Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, by John B. Watson. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. $2.50.

EVERYBODY who is anybody, or wants to be, has a "psychology" today, and makes knowing remarks about other people's. Speculation and dogmatizing about the patterns and processes of the conduct of men has a contemporaneous vogue the terms of which are symptomatic. Men have ceased to be clear in their hearts about their own motives and actions, and have become suspicious of those of their fellows. They have thought to find escape from confusion and insecurity in the aridities of the laboratory and the jungles of the psycho-analysts. But the laboratories have been sterile and the psycho-analysts fantastic. The former have yielded sand-grains of information, mostly futile; the latter have, from the backwash of the psychiatric clinics blown a shining Pandemonium like an exhalation, from the swampy ground. Each remains in need of a receivership and a strict and due accounting at the hands of the other. Both would profit by liquidation and reorganization on a scientific basis.

The chances of such an eventuality are enormously furthered by John Watson's Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behavorist and Bertrand Russell's The Analysis of Mind. To those who have been troubled by the sterility of the laboratories and the fantasies of the psycho-analysts, the reading of these two books together will be an exciting and liberating adventure.

Of the two, Watson's is the earlier, and likely to be the more enduring in its effects. It is a construction, not an analysis, of mind. Its matter is a part of the thing that Russell analyzes and it is a sensational and startling part. Written as an elementary text-book for students, it brings together, for the first time in simple language and logically very articulate form, the observations, inferences, and hypotheses concerning the motives and conduct of man which for a score of years have been accumulating and gaining dignity and weight with scientific observers under the title Behaviorism. It is, Mr. Watson states, "a purely American production," and its objective is to make and to keep psychology compatible, as it has not until now been, "with the universal terms of science." Those terms require the discovery and formulation of the causal laws which operate in the psychological field, and their valuation and testing by the inevitable criteria of scientific method—the criteria of prediction and control of the events in the domain to which the laws apply.

Now the testings, so far as they have gone, result in the startling conclusion that the ordinary categories of psychology are superfluous, that for purposes of prediction and control in the matters of human behavior, it is better to dispense with the idea of consciousness, and to avoid such terms as sensation, perception, attention, will, and so on. The fundamental assumptions of behaviorist psychology are the human body, with its receptors and reactors; its sense organs and its striped and unstriped muscles and glands, responding in simple or combined reflexes to stimuli within the body in patterns which are hereditary or habitual, which are explicit and observable, or implicit and difficult to observe, but which are always patterns of bodily behavior in which there takes place an integration of reflexes connecting the receptors with the muscles and glands.

In a word, for Watson it is the body that thinks, and its thinking must be observable as the changes in form and order of action of the parts of which it is composed. These changes fall, broadly speaking, into three groups—emotions, instincts and habits. Basically emotions are "hereditary pattern-reactions," changes that take place in the organism without external reference and with a disorganizing effect. Instincts differ from them in that they are actions which do have external reference, and are often adaptive, although like emotions they may often be non-adaptive and even anti-adaptive. On emotion and instinct our humanity is founded, and from them our personality gets its quality and flavor. But precisely because they are the foundations of the house of life, they cannot figure in the superstructure, in the human quality itself. We live on, not in, our foundations. The superstructure sets, modifies, and readjusts the incidence of force in them. The generic name for this superstructure is Habit. It is something altogether additive to the original nature of man, the substance of personality, the stuff of character, and the essence of mind. To have a mind, according to Dr. Watson, is to be possessed of flexible systems of habits which are the patterns of response to situations old and new: minding is, for him, behaving. And to think is to be possessed of a system of special habits involving the organs of speech in a generic "language habit." For Dr. Watson, thinking is talking—aloud or silently. Talking begins as merely vocal acts, noises. These become in the course of time associated with arm, head and leg movements, and ultimately are substituted for them and act as symbols of them. They develop into overt habits by social training, and are so easy accompaniments of all action of other kinds, that they become a part of the individual's reaction to any situation, and words take the place of things as stimuli to overt action.

In the adjustment of these habits—muscular, glandular, linguistic—to one another, and to their instinctive and emotional base, in their durability, their plasticity or rigidity, their sufficiency or inadequacy, their appropriateness or irrelevancy, lie all the problems of personality in work and play, disease and health. However else these problems may be stated—whether in the terms of Freud or the terms of St. Thomas—they can be manipulated and controlled only in the terms of behavior.

So Dr. Watson, following deeply and narrowly a tradition beginning in the laboratory study of the behavior of animals, unaware of or disregarding the massive, older, more voluminous and wider-ranging tradition of the disciplines of the "mental sciences," which began with Aristotle and which is represented today by the academic laboratory psychology, the "new" psychology of the Freudians, the preconceptions of the sociologists and political scientists, and all their derivatives. He accepts without question the assumptions on which rest the mores of the sciences of matter, particularly the physical and the physiological ones, and he goes his way serenely, fully at ease in his Zion, and regardless of the world beyond.

Not so Mr. Bertrand Russell. Mr. Russell approaches the question "What is Mind?" from exactly those premises of tradition which Dr. Watson finds it so easy and natural to disregard. Russell is preoccupied with what Watson finds useless and irrelevant. For Russell, mind links itself up with all those problems of metaphysics and epistemology which are the nodes in the philosophic tradition, and in which he is very conversant. The result is that his analysis of mind is not so much a study in psychology as an exercise in logic dominated by metaphysical implications. As psy-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chology, it is an unsettled rather than a conclusive book. It both derives from Watson and controverts him. Its themes are mostly those things which Watson disregards—memory, meaning, perception, sensation, general ideas, belief, thought, truth, falsehood, and so on—and the position which it presents is for Russell a new one. A thinker of scrupulous honesty of mind, his method, which derives from long and highly skilled habituation in mathematical technique, leads to the elaboration of complete systems from such premises of fact or opinion as are at hand and as he acquiesces in. When he happens upon different and more pleasing or at the time, more momentous premises, he abandons the old for the new, as one abandons an old pair of shoes. Russell, in a word, is that rarity among philosophers, a thinker who cares more about being correct than being consistent, so that his systems follow his discoveries as swiftly as meditation can construct them.

In the present instance he has discovered Behaviorism, and he remembers and still believes the conclusions he some years ago came to with regard to the data of physics. His concern in this current analysis of mind is to adjust the two into a single system. This he does by reexamining in succession the traditional concepts of traditional psychology and assigning to matter what is matter's and to mind what is mind's. The upshot of his analysis is a view which, he points out, is not unlike that of William James and his realistic pupils: the view, namely, that mind and matter are secondary and not primary existences, and that there is a primary existence which may be indifferently either, according to the logical constructions by which it is placed. This primary existence Russell , following Edwin Holt, calls "neutral stuff." He describes it as a collection of "particulars" which, when grouped by their "active places" (Watson would probably say, when regarded as stimuli) are the subject-matter of physics, and when grouped by their "passive places" (in Watson's language, "responses") are the subject-matter of psychology. So grouped, they fall under quite different types of causal laws, and psychology is constituted first of all, by the operation in its field of a type of causation for which Russell uses Semon's term, "mnemic." It is with respect to this causation and its imputed effects that he absolutely parts company with the behaviorists. He thinks that their conclusions outstrip the evidence, that their attempts to reduce "mnemic" to physical causation may ultimately be warranted, but so far, are not. A true empiricism would require, in Mr. Russell's opinion, the retention of most of the traditional categories of psychology, even though many and extensive concessions to behaviorist views be made.

Mind and matter, Russell finds, coincide in sensation. From that they move into their respective diversities in terms of their respective causations. Mind develops by way of "mnemic causation" in the form of images, thoughts, memories and habits. By "mnemic causation" Russell means the sequence of necessary change in which "the proximate cause consists not merely of a present event, but of this together with a past event." Without it—and the behaviorists seem to do without it—such phenomena as the knowledge of the past, as images, as the meaning of words, as belief, and so on, cannot be adequately explained. Without it there is merely physiology, not psychology. And until Behaviorism has fully and in detail harmonized it and the phenomena it accounts for with its own basic assumptions, which are those of physical causation. it must fall short of being psychology. The analysis of mind by means of it leads to the conclusion that mind as distinguished from matter consists of images; that consciousness consists of the meaning that these images or that words acquire when they are accompanied by the belief that they are signs of something absent in time or space, remembered or imaged; and that the practical efficiency of consciousness consists essentially in this "sensitiveness to signs," as the overwhelming rôle of words in experience shows. Consciousness is marked, in addition, by "subjectivity," subjectivity being in Mr. Russell's conception the characteristic "of giving a view of the world from a certain place." It is what occurs in perspectives and biographies, and it holds of a photographic negative as well as of a mind. While not mental, it is presupposed in all mental phenomena. In sum, for Russell, minding is not quite behaving, and thinking is nearly, but not altogether, talking.

It would be useless to elaborate this summary further. Elaboration would lead to discussion of metaphysics and theory of knowledge, not of psychology. Although the point of the book is a psychological point, the preconceptions on which it is made and the technique by which it is made range far from the domain which the psychologist studies and the instrumentalities he uses. It is, for example, a structural rather than a genetic survey. Tested by Watson's criteria of prediction and control, it can hardly be said to be fruitful. Its chief value, so far as is concerned the progress of psychology in the direction of scientific competency, is critical. It calls attention to data ignored and repressed, to unwarranted inference, to hasty generalization, to assumptions implicit and unexamined, with which those on the line of advance for psychology can perhaps hardly avoid endangering their work, but against which they must guard. As such, it is a genuine contribution to science. As a "system" of the metaphysics of mind—but that is another story.

H. M. KALLEN.

Delos F. Wilcox on Transit

Analysis of the Electric Railway Problem, by Delos F. Wilcox. New York: Published by the author.

THE Federal Commission on Electric Railways was created by the President May 31, 1919, at the instance of the street railway companies. In the view of the companies the roads were not earning enough at prevailing fares. The remedy was simple: increase fares until earnings rise high enough. The difficulty lay in getting the medicine administered. The companies were willing, but the perverse public cherished old franchises and clamored for the retention of the five-cent fare as resolutely as the companies on previous occasions had done. The public needed to be taught, authoritatively, that old fares were too low. A federal commission should be able to get the news to the people, impressively, perhaps even dramatically.

The commission sat, and heard the full tale of the spokesmen of the American Electric Railway Association. It undertook to explore alternative possibilities. In October, 1919, it employed Dr. Delos F. Wilcox to analyze the enormous volume of evidence and testimony presented. Dr. Wilcox is preeminently the man for a job of this sort. His analysis is a thoroughgoing one. Where the testimony did not contain the information needed about

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a subject, he knew where to get it, and did. Where the testimony was chaotic, he knew how to give form to the problems.

From a reading of Dr. Wilcox's analysis it appears that in preliminary generalities there was sufficient harmony. The divergence of opinion began when the spokesmen of the electric railway interests implicitly identified the credit of the companies as now organized with the credit of the industry. They saw no reason to bring up ancient scandals. The watered securities had passed to innocent hands while they were flourishing; it needed but a small part of the fare to make them good; in many cases the water had been thickened with solid capital, taken from earnings, or by appreciation of values under war prices. There was no disposition to deny the frenzied financiering of earlier days, nor to palliate it as of the time of its commission. But now by-gones should be by-gones, and the old companies should be started off anew.

Objections were made. The credit of the old companies might not be the same as that of the industry. The conspicuous exception to the "no dividends no credit" malady is the Cleveland company, from which the water had been squeezed by reorganization. Certainly the reduction of capitalization and capital charges would not obviate the rise of costs of operation, but it would diminish the aggregate demand upon the revenues of the companies. The doubling of Cleveland's three-cent fare was a very different thing in all its consequences from the doubling of Boston's five-cent fare. Is it either desirable or possible to restore the credit of the existing companies without a readjustment of capitalization?

If capitalization is to be readjusted it is necessary to determine a valuation. There are many methods of valuation, and he would be an unresourceful company expert who could not build the value of a property up to its capitalization or a bit more. He can concede the omission of franchise values; but he makes a solemn case for the inclusion of going concern value, promotion costs, development costs, and any other intangible elements he may think of. Since the rise of material and construction costs he is quite willing to make his valuation upon cost to reproduce new. He is inclined to use war prices in so doing. He sees that it is physically impossible to keep a property in as good condition as of the day it was put into use, and that in a condition of normal depreciation it renders as good service as though it were all new. He is opposed to writing off the normal depreciation from the capital account. He is disposed to add the appreciation of the value of the land. He would capitalize superseded and obsolete property, outlays for paving and for any other things required to be done by public authority. The valuator for the city, on the other hand, is disposed to rule out almost all intangibles, to arrive at costs by using prices of prior years or terms of years, to insist upon deducting full depreciation, and so to keep valuations down. Wide discrepancies of simultaneous valuations of the same property are notorious. A remarkable valuation was that made of the Pittsburgh street railways, by a board of engineers, two representing the city, two the company, with the chief engineer of the Pennsylvania Public Service Commission as chairman. Upon the same property they amicably arrived at seven different valuations, upon as many bases, ranging from slightly over forty-nine millions to slightly under 103 millions.

Manifestly, while such differences are possible, the riders are going to object to increasing fares to pay dividends upon disputable millions of the high valuations. And while these differences are unsettled, the wise investor will withhold his good money. In Cleveland the question of value was settled beyond question, and, with low fares and a waterless capitalization, the president of the company testified that he did not know what a banker was in his business. Cleveland, indeed, was a pest and a nuisance to the spokesmen of the American Electric Railway Association, for all its marvelous success with service-at-cost.

Whether dividends were to be paid or not most of the companies were hard pressed for revenues. Prices of all materials had advanced. Wages perforce had increased. Operating costs had risen to heights unimagined when the five-cent fare was regarded as a gold mine. The only adequate remedy, so far as the operators could see, was to increase the fare. There were, however, a number of minor economies which might postpone or palliate the increase. The cities might remit licenses and taxes, and might relieve the companies of franchise obligations to clean and repair pavements. The skip-stop would help somewhat. Service on unprofitable lines might be diminished or discontinued, and extensions might be foregone. Many of these expedients were tried, but they availed little. What was needed was to get the fare above five cents.

In the view of the American Electric Railway Association, then, the public owed responsibilities to the companies which had come to distress upon the streets. It should defend them from competition, relieve them of burdens, absolve them of their financial sins, pay increased fares, and accept diminished service. The companies would not ask for unlimited returns, if assured of a definite return adequate to restore their credit. Such, in their conception, is "service-at-cost."

Service-at-cost implies agencies for the determination of cost and the fixing of fares accordingly, and the establishment of standards of service. It may take the form of local franchise contracts, as in Cleveland and some other cities, or that of regulation by state public utility commissions. The American Electric Railway Association looked with benevolence upon both. Both, however, had other opponents.

Car riders are given to thinking that street transportation is a local function, and the regulation and control thereof should be lodged nearer than in a state commission, which is open to the suspicion of being concerned more with stabilizing investments than with getting service to the rider as he would like it. Nor is the rider anxious just now for service-at-cost franchises. He lost the enthusiasm he used to have for them when the companies began saying costs were above five cents a ride.

The spokesman of the American Electric Railway Association politely dismissed public ownership, as sure to be inefficient and wasteful and to throw the street railways and their employees into politics, and to cause other vague but desperate evils. In one condition it might be acceptable, namely, if it should turn out to be impossible to restore credit to the companies. But public ownership had its advocates. They told the commission that the public is capable of its own service enterprises. For it seems to them that the public interest in transit is so great as to require constant public attention, and that the public interest can be better served directly than by attempting to control an intermediate private corporation. They questioned the superior efficiency of private management, when it has to be constantly regulated in minute

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

detail. When the public assumes the responsibilities of supervising capital outlays, of fixing wages, and virtually that of assuring investors of a satisfactory return, there is little left for which it is not responsible. Yet its authority is limited and its ability to serve itself is hindered. The street railways could hardly be more in politics under public ownership than they are under private. The conclusion is inescapable that an industry which is so permeated with the public interest should be carried on by the public affected. Dr. Wilcox found it so when he came to the end of his analysis.

In its report the Commission told the President that "Dr. Wilcox made a very comprehensive analysis of the evidence, covering 823 pages of matter. The Commission regrets that it cannot publish this analysis with the proceedings since it represents a complete and masterful study of the whole electric railway problem." The Commission, it should be explained, did not adopt Dr. Wilcox's conclusions. It was not persuaded that the time was ripe for public ownership. It was persuaded that the time for a fixed low fare was past. The public and the companies should compose their differences upon some service-at-cost basis.

It may be that the companies got their money's worth out of the Commission's hearings. Its report and proceedings were published and distributed at the expense of the American Electric Railway Association. They have not yet become best sellers. For all that shows on the surface, the public of the cities where transit is an issue has forgotten the hearings and does not know that the report was ever issued.

Dr. Wilcox himself has published his analysis, and this the public should not forget. It is a long book. Nothing is overlooked. There are whole chapters of great value, hardly suggested in the preceding paragraphs. The ramifications of finance, the intricacies of operation and management, the general social and economic aspects of service and fares, the relations of wages and labor conditions, the politics and control of transit are all in the book, as well as some highly illuminating special studies included as appendices. Its very bulk makes the book a formidable one to read. But no one can afford to solve a metropolitan transit problem without having read it.

EMMETT L. BENNETT.

The Antic Philosophers

Sinbad and His Friends, by Simeon Strunsky. New York: Henry Holt. $1.75.

Seeing Things at Night, by Heywood Broun. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. $1.75.

Noah an' Jonah an' Cap'n John Smith, by Don Marquis. New York: D. Appleton & Co. $1.75.

A Penny Whistle, by Bert Leston Taylor. New York: Alfred Knopf. $1.50.

SIMEON STRUNSKY makes good play with workaday material. The skits in Sinbad and his Friends reflect city life as it buzzes into an editorial office. Business fads, society foibles, advertising, propaganda, censorship, high rents, the everlasting politics, and the New Education are a few of the topics that engage Mr. Strunsky's wit. All of these matters might be classified as light editorial, but the word editorial is alarming. These skits compare to conventional editorials as the saratoga chip to the boiled potato.

The form in which Mr. Strunsky casts his comment reflects the present interest in oriental settings. The Bagdad background employed for about half the sketches has the verisimilitude of a community masque, which is about what the author intended. If one could imagine a satirical community masque, this would be it. With a keen eye and a hard, brilliant wit Mr. Strunsky strides among the hoakum beds flicking off the head of each tallest poppycock. For all the sharpness of this trifling no one probably will be offended. Seldom does satire make such pleasant reading.

Most of the short papers in Seeing Things at Night are products of Heywood Broun's activities as a book inspector. The clever title, suggested, it is said, by poker, might cover equally well the plays on which this journalist nightly sits in judgment, but not much dramatic criticism has been included in this collection.

There is generally a book to start one of Mr. Broun's book chats but he ramifies in unexpected directions. His interests are timely and taking. A Harvard man, though without obtrusive class consciousness, he tosses poisoned persiflage to the Yale bulldog and the Princeton tiger. A fond but philosophical parent he hooks the professional parents without losing his other readers. The piquancy of his comment on books may be illustrated from the essay on "Woman," by Magdeleine Marx. Of his attempts to read this somewhat hysterical product Mr. Broun writes, "At the last attempt, under whip and spur, we reached page 46 and there we found: 'A gentle pearl gray breeze was stirring the curtains'! We can go no further. There is nothing to do but to lie down and wait for the St. Bernards."

Mr. Broun's opinion of a book is seldom questionable and his taste is good. Behind an apparent naïveté he employs a complicated humor. To make babies interesting to bookmen and books interesting to babies is no small task, but the humorous clarity of Mr. Broun's critiques may be guaranteed for these results.

In his dual rôle of light verse poet and antic philosopher, Don Marquis stands almost alone among living Americans. He has wit and humor, whimsy and sentiment. Though his work is decidedly uneven, each of his collections contains things of the very first excellence in their genre.

The title poem in Noah an' Jonah an' Cap'n John Smith, a rollicking extravaganza in the vernacular, probably marks highwater mark for the comic fishing yarn, at least in verse. Strumming their golden harps, the three deified navigators swap lies to the despair of all lesser lyres, in meter that purrs like a well oiled reel.

Comic exaggeration, and levity with scriptural material, are two very American forms of humor. Readers with a more English and perhaps a more delicate taste in fun will find exactly what they like in Reverie of a Gentleman of sensibility at an Italian Table d'Hote. Nonsense and sensibility combine in this lyrical lament as in the best of Lewis Carroll. How Mr. Marquis gets from sardines to dinosaurs would take too long to tell, but the dinosaur provides him with this inspiration:

> I never see a dinosaur,
> So patient and so mute.
> But that a song of pity springs
> Unbidden to my lute—
> He stayed a lizard, but he wished
> To be a bird, poor brute!

Standing, as Don Marquis does, a living link between the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3rd Large Printing! Don't Delay Getting Your Copy

GREAT as we knew this book to be, the reception accorded to it by the critics swept us off our feet. There has not been a single dissenting note in the chorus of praise which has hailed Van Loon's "Story" as one of the most fascinating and important books ever published for both young and old.

A Book That You MUST Own and Read!

HENDRIK VAN LOON'S THE STORY OF MANKIND

MAYBE it is because the story flows along in episodes, colorful, brilliant and rounded, like a motion-picture film. Possibly it is because of the curious and fascinating "animated maps" of the author's own handiwork. Probably it is because of the utter simplicity of the style and method, but certainly Van Loon has written one of the most unusual books of a bookful year.

He knows how to tell the tale of history in a manner so simple, readable, interesting and even fascinating that the reader is as loath to lay down the book unfinished as he would be to put aside a detective yarn, a good Western story or Poe's "The Purloined Letter."—*Philadelphia Ledger.*

The book is primarily intended for children, to give them a taste for history, an aim it will certainly achieve. But we think that a still more enthusiastic audience will be found among the grown-ups, and that they will make "The Story of Mankind" one of the big successes of the publishing season. —Austin Hay, *New York Times.*

There is only one word that describes Mr. Van Loon's originality, his subtle wisdom, his love and understanding of children, his reduction of complex material to lucid and dramatic simplicity; and that word is genius.—J. Salwyn Schapiro, *The Nation.*

For grasp on historic fact, for style and for insight, I prefer plain Mr. Van Loon (without his Ph.D.) to Bishop Bossuet or "Bishop" Wells. He has written a great book, one that will endure.—Charles A. Beard, *The New Republic.*

"What a jolly way to tell history!"—Henry Hansen, *Chicago News.*

The most invigorating, and I venture to predict, the most influential children's book for many years to come is Hendrik Van Loon's "Story of Mankind." . . . After many years of looking and longing for *real* books to add to our libraries, a book is here that bids fair to revolutionize the writing and illustrating of history and biography for the fortunate youth of this generation and the next. . . . It takes its place among the most distinguished books of the year for grown people as well as children."—Annie Carroll Moore, *The Bookman.*

At All Bookstores. $5.00 (You'll Say It's Worth A Hundred)

The THEATRE *of* TOMORROW

By KENNETH MACGOWAN

With EIGHTY Illustrations in COLOR, Half-tone, and Line, making this THE MOST COMPLETE VISUALIZATION of the new movement in the theatre to be had in book form.

IT is the purpose of this important volume to set forth the ideas behind the new stagecraft, the reforms in the physical playhouse and the changes in contemporary plays which all point toward a new drama.

Mr. Macgowan's volume easily supersedes all other books on the modern theatre. And its beautiful format and exquisite illustrations make "The Theatre of Tomorrow" a treasure to the booklover as well as to all who are interested in the drama.

The Chapter Headings

PART I. THE NEW STAGECRAFT

I. The Twentieth Century Theatre
II. The Mechanician
III. The Electrician
IV. The Painter
V. The Accomplishments of Gordon Craig
VI. Adolph Appia—Light as Dramatist
VII. The Plastic Stage
VIII. Expressionism in the Theatre
IX. The Formal Stage
X. Re-animating the Actor

PART II. THE NEW PLAYHOUSE

XI. The Eternal Theatre
XII. The Movies—The Curtain Becomes the Stage
XIII. The Next Theatre

PART III. THE NEW PLAY

XIV. A Theatre Without Plays
XV. The Twilight of Realism
XVI. The Form of the Future
XVII. The Content of the Future
XVIII. A Drama of Intimacy and of Crowds
XIX. The Theatre of Tomorrow

Printed in large type on English laid, high white paper, with uncut edges. The binding is black library buckram with orange decoration and gold stamping. Full octavo. $5.00 net.

BONI & LIVERIGHT NEW YORK — MODERN LIBRARY

Please mention The New Republic when writing to advertisers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

light verse lizards and the birds of serious song it may well be that he has put a little personal parable into this poignant stanza.

Bert Leston Taylor's last book of verse contains the best of his poetic work during the last eight years. The verse runs in his terse and vigorous vein, the topics ranging over life, literature, and music as observed by Chicago's shrewdest and pleasantest commentator.

B. L. T. had a fine personal philosophy and his light verse is at his best when it is a little serious. The poem, In Status Quo, in this collection is a fine bit of star gazing with the same faintly ironic charm that marks his own favorite Canopus in an earlier collection. This gentle pessimist turned to the stars for cosmic relief from the comic littleness of his "so-called human race." Another outlet for his more wistful moods was his little daughter Babette:

> Birds and babies are, we know,
> Best of creatures here below;
> But for them how dull a place
> Were this drifting speck in space.

The Babette Ballads in this book are patterns of restrained and delicate sentiment.

Since many readers might attempt to judge Mr. Taylor's reputation by this single volume, it seems only fair to him to say that his best verse in the purely comic vein appears in earlier collections. Many also of his finest flashes went into paragraphs, a sadly evanescent form. Some of these fortunately are to be retrieved in a forthcoming book, and have their chance of permanence. B. L. T. was one of those rare literary men who transcend their chosen medium. But as the patron saint of columnists his fame is secure.

KEITH PRESTON.

Selected Current Books

Making Woodrow Wilson President, by William F. McCombs. Fairview. $2.50.

This book narrates Mr. McCombs's part in making Woodrow Wilson President. The preface says "The President not only spurned his political maker," but found a merited retribution shortly after.

Lost Valley, by Katharine Fullerton Gerould. Harpers. $2.00.

Mrs. Gerould's first full length novel which is a study of character in modern America.

Contributors

EDWIN J. CLAPP is a consulting economist in New York City, specializing in traffic reports. He is the author of Economic Aspects of the War, The Port of Boston, and Railway Traffic.

SUSANNE K. LANGER graduated from Radcliffe in 1920. She is at present studying at the University of Vienna.

DOROTHÉE RAËL MEIROWSKY is a young Russian who has been educated in this country, specializing in philosophy and psychology at Columbia University. Her articles on Upper Silesia have appeared in the Nation, the New York American and the New York Globe.

MANLEY O. HUDSON is a professor at the Harvard Law School.

JANET A. FAIRBANK has been prominent in civic enterprises in Chicago. She has written dramatic criticism for the Chicago Herald and the Chicago Evening Post.

H. M. KALLEN is on the staff of the New School for Social Research, New York City. He is the author of Zionism and World Politics.

KEITH PRESTON is on the editorial staff of the Chicago Daily News. He has recently published a book called Splinters.

L'Europe Nouvelle

is the leading French weekly chiefly devoted to foreign affairs.

It is the only review in Europe which provides a complete and unbiased information concerning international relations from the standpoint of politics, economics and literature.

At the same time it puts forward the views of the liberal sections of European and American opinion. Its chief regular contributors are:

FRANCE: *Philippe Millet,* editor of the Review, also foreign editor of LE PETIT PARISIEN, one of the best known experts on European affairs.
L. Weiss: assistant editor who made a name as the ablest French expert on Central Europe and Russia.

AMERICA: *Paul Scott Mowrer,* Paris Correspondent of the CHICAGO DAILY NEWS, who possesses an exceptional knowledge both of American and European conditions.

GREAT BRITAIN: *George Glasgow,* also London Correspondent of the MANCHESTER GUARDIAN, and former subeditor of the NEW EUROPE, one of the chief exponents of the new British radicalism.

ITALY: *Verax,* a well known Italian authority on foreign affairs.

Occasional contributors are recruited among the leading statesmen and experts on foreign affairs in every country.

PRICE: 1 year .....7 dollars
6 months.....4 dollars
3 months.....2 dollars, 50

Subscriptions are received at the office of THE NEW REPUBLIC in New York.

JUST PUBLISHED

PENOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

By LOUIS N. ROBINSON, Ph.D.

For three and one half years Chief Probation Officer, Municipal Court of Philadelphia; formerly head of the Department of Economics in Swarthmore College.

An Important Subject Dealt With By A Recognized Authority

The latest survey, and really the only one, of exactly how criminals are now being handled in the United States. Acquaints the general reader with a definite and very expensive part of our great social machinery. Latest developments in the field fully discussed.

CRIME AND ITS PUNISHMENT

The book discusses the theory of Punishment, Jails, Workhouses and Houses of Correction, State Prisons and Penitentiaries, Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents, Reformatories, Prison Labor, Prison Management, Probation and Parole, etc., etc.

Bound in Cloth-cover 300 pages $3.00 NET

PUBLISHERS THE JOHN C. WINSTON CO. PHILADELPHIA

NOW, WHAT ABOUT OUR BANKS

is a book by Russ Webb, a westerner, with a new line of thought that analyzes our banking system with a new vision. It strips our banks of their cloak of mysticism and their air of dominance and lays bare their inner workings so that Mr. Average Man can see right through and beyond them. It discards timeworn conventionalism and places the banker in his proper place among us. It reveals the bank's privileges and duties toward the community and the individual, and then it shows why the goods are not—cannot be—delivered. It outlines a systematic change in our monetary machine and directs how, step by step, it may be brought about. It points the individual to his own opportunities and responsibilities and then presents him with a manual of procedure. It is economic theory, plus practical business, told in the light of actual observation. Every progressive man or woman will read it. Single copy, postpaid, $1.00. Independent Publisher, Fort Lapwai, Idaho.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED